DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 134 188 IR 004 362

AUTHOR Pfister, Fred C.; Alexander, Karen
TITLE Discrepancies between Actual and Ideal Roles and Functions of Texas School Librarians as Perceived by School Superintendents, Principals, and Librarians. Report of a Study.
SPONS AGENCY North Texas State Univ., Denton.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 199p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$10.03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Analysis of Variance; Audiovisual Aids; Data Analysis; Hypothesis Testing; Instructional Materials Centers; *Librarians; Library Acquisition; Library Planning; *Library Research; Library Services; *Library Surveys; *School Libraries
IDENTIFIERS Texas

ABSTRACT

This study examines the actual and the desired performance of school librarians in areas of planning, accessing networks, instructional and curriculum development, and production of learning resources. A questionnaire based on the 1976 certification requirements for Texas learning resources specialists was constructed as the survey instrument. Research problems were tested according to two principal criteria: (1) perceptions of superintendents, principals, and librarians, and (2) the size, location and level of selected school districts. Based on data analysis, this report concludes that: (1) all three major groups of respondents agree on the gap between perceived actual versus ideal conditions; (2) librarians' responsibility for selection and acquisition of audiovisual materials receives less recognition than their responsibility regarding print materials; (3) librarians do not fully participate in management and planning activities; (4) the size of the school district affects the librarian's service and management functions; (5) librarians are not accepted in the instructional role; (6) librarians' access to resources is limited within the school district; (7) communication between librarians and administrators is lacking. These findings are generalizable to a wider population. (SC)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED134188

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGAN ZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN ACTUAL AND IDEAL ROLES AND FUNCTIONS OF TEXAS SCHOOL LIBRARIANS AS PERCEIVED BY SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS, PRINCIPALS, AND LIBRARIANS

REPORT OF A STUDY
CONDUCTED WITH THE AID OF
A NORTH TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY RESEARCH GRANT
AND IN COOPERATION WITH
REGIONAL SERVICE CENTERS TEN & ELEVEN

BY

FRED C. PFISTER
AND
KAREN ALEXANDER

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Fred C. Pfister

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

IR 004362

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors of this report wish to acknowledge the assistance from Dr. Frank Buell and Mr. R.P. Campbell, Jr. from Education Service Center XI, and to Dr. Joe Farmer and Dr. Haydn Goodgion from Education Service Center 10, for their cooperation in providing consultation on the research design, the timetable for the study, identification of pilot study districts, printing of survey forms and cover letters, and for Education Service Center co-sponsorship of the study in correspondence directed to superintendents, principals, and librarians. Ms. Nora Ernst, Office of Research, NTSU College of Education; Dr. Hamilton Monroe, our colleague in the library school; and Sandra Kincaid, statistician at the U.S. Department of Labor in Dallas gave us valuable advisement on statistics and research design questions. Thanks also to Mrs. Linda Bostic, a student who generated the whole study by asking the right question at the right time and who later worked on the study as a research assistant and to Abigail Hubbard, another research assistant who came in to help finish up and has shown lots of true grit as well as competence.

Finally, we would like to express our appreciation to the State of Texas for making research funds available. Without the research grant funds this project could not have been undertaken.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Review of Related Literature	2
	Description of the Study	4
	Definition of Terms	8
II.	RESPONSIBILITY	11
	Introduction	11
	Data Analysis	11
	Findings--T-Test for Correlated Samples	13
	Findings--Analysis of Variance	13
III.	PERFORMANCE	53
	Performance Area I	53
	Performance Area II	62
	Performance Area III	66
	Don't Know Responses	72
IV.	LIBRARIANS	76
	All Librarians: Elementary vs. Secondary	76
	Traditional librarian activities	76
	Management functions	82
	Local production of materials functions	87
	Urban Librarians: Elementary vs. Secondary	90
	All Librarians: Large Districts vs. Small Districts	92
	Performance areas I, II, and III	96
V.	PRINCIPALS	100
	All Elementary Principals vs. All Secondary Principals	100
	Performance area I	106
	Performance area II and III	106
	Urban Principals: Elementary vs. Secondary	113
	All Principals: Large Districts vs. Small Districts	116
	Responsibility	116
	Performance areas I and III	121
	All Principals: Urban vs. Rural	123
	Responsibility area	123
	Performance areas I, II, & III	126

Chapter		Page
VI.	SUPERINTENDENT INTERVIEWS	130
	Introduction	130
	Interview Results	131
	Means for Improvement Suggested by the Superintendent Interviews	141
VII.	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	143
	Introduction	143
	Summary of Findings	146
	T-Test	146
	ANOVA--Superintendents, Librarians and Principals	146
	ANOVA--Subgroups of Librarians	149
	ANOVA--Subgroups of Principals	150
	Superintendent Interviews	151
	Conclusions	151
	Recommendations Drawn From the Study	155
	Recommendations for Further Research	157
Appendix		
I.	SURVEY INSTRUMENT AND COVER LETTERS	159
II.	A COMPARISON OF ACTUAL RANKINGS WITH IDEAL RANKINGS: DATA FROM THE T-TEST FOR CORRELATED SAMPLES	172
III.	SUPERINTENDENTS INTERVIEWED	178
BIBLIOGRAPHY		180

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Results of one-way analysis of variance for statement number 1: The librarian has responsibility for formulating long range plans for the library	14
2	Results of one-way analysis of variance for statement number 2: When new or remodeled library plan facilities are needed, the librarian has responsibility for preparing the educational specifications for them	16
3	Results of one-way analysis of variance for statement number 3: When new or remodeled library facilities are planned, the librarian has responsibility for planning for the floor design, furnishings, etc.	17
4	Results of one-way analysis of variance for statement number 4: The librarian has responsibility for planning facilities for local design and production of learning resources	18
5	Frequency distribution for statement number 4: The librarian has responsibility for planning facilities for local design and production of learning resources	20
6	Results of one-way analysis of variance for statement number 5: When funds are available from sources outside the local district, the librarian has responsibility for preparing proposals for obtaining them	21
7	Results of one-way analysis of variance for statement number 6: The librarian has responsibility for coordinating deliveries and returns of materials from the school district's center. (Answer only if your district maintains a district learning resources center)	22
8	Results of one-way analysis of variance for statement number 7: The librarian has responsibility for coordinating deliveries and returns of materials from the regional service center	23
9	Results of one-way analysis of variance for statement number 8: The librarian has responsibility for providing for use of materials from outside the school by activities such as Inter-library Loan and maintaining a community resources file	24

Table		Page
10	Results of one-way analysis of variance for statement number 9: The librarian has responsibility for designing and conducting in-service training programs for teachers	26
11	Results of one-way analysis of variance for statement number 10: The librarian has responsibility for providing in-service education for the library staff (including volunteers).	27
12	Frequency distribution for statement number 10: The librarian has responsibility for providing in-service education for the library staff (including volunteers)	28
13	Results of one-way analysis of variance for statement number 11: The librarian has responsibility for campus level production of materials that aid teachers in the classroom	30
14	Results of one-way analysis of variance for statement number 12: The librarian has responsibility for teaching students how to produce audio-visual materials	31
15	Results of one-way analysis of variance for statement number 13: The librarian has responsibility for developing the listening, viewing, and responding skills of students	32
16	Results of one-way analysis of variance for statement number 14: The librarian has responsibility for developing the reading and responding skills of students	34
17	Results of one-way analysis of variance for statement number 15: The librarian has responsibility for formulating and recommending for adoption policies for the evaluation and selection of audio-visual materials for the collection	36
18	Results of one-way analysis of variance for statement number 16: The librarian has responsibility for formulating and recommending for adoption policies for the evaluation and selection of library books, periodicals, and other print materials for the collection	37
19	Results of one-way analysis of variance for statement number 17: The librarian has responsibility for evaluating and selecting audio-visual equipment	38
20	Results of one-way analysis of variance for statement number 18: The librarian has responsibility for making adequate provision for previewing materials being considered for the collection	39

Table		Page
21	Frequency distribution for statement number 15: The librarian has responsibility for formulating and recommending for adoption policies for the evaluation and selection of audio-visual materials for the collection (ideal condition)	41
22	Frequency distribution for statement number 17: The librarian has responsibility for evaluating and selecting audio-visual equipment (ideal condition)	42
23	Results of one-way analysis of variance for statement number 19: The librarian has responsibility for developing and implementing procedures for acquisition (by purchase, exchange, or gift) of print materials	43
24	Results of one-way analysis of variance for statement number 20: The librarian has responsibility for developing and implementing procedures for acquisition of audio-visual materials	44
25	Results of one-way analysis of variance for statement number 21: The librarian has responsibility for acquiring audio-visual equipment	45
26	Results of one-way analysis of variance for statement number 22: The librarian has responsibility for the storage and scheduling of audio-visual equipment	47
27	Frequency distribution for statement number 22: The librarian has responsibility for the storage and scheduling of audio-visual equipment (actual condition)	48
28	Frequency distribution for statement number 22: The librarian has responsibility for the storage and scheduling of audio-visual equipment (ideal condition)	49
29	Results of one-way analysis of variance for statement number 23: The librarian has responsibility for developing policies and procedures for maintenance of audio-visual equipment	50
30	Frequency distribution for statement number 23: The librarian has responsibility for developing policies and procedures for maintenance of audio-visual equipment	51
31	Statement number 24. The librarian disseminates information to students and teachers on the availability of materials, equipment, and resources in the library	54
32	Statement number 25. The librarian promotes the library's collections and services by such means as displays, book talks, and classroom presentations	54

Table		Page
33	Statement number 26. The librarian disseminates information to students and teachers on effective use of materials and equipment	54
34	Statement number 27. The librarian provides information to teachers on new teaching developments and practices	55
35	Statement number 28. The librarian provides teachers with lists of materials useful in instruction	55
36	Statement number 29. The librarian participates on curriculum planning committees	56
37	Frequency distribution for statement number 29: The librarian participates on curriculum planning committees (actual condition)	57
38	Frequency distribution for statement number 29: The librarian participates on curriculum planning committees (ideal condition)	57
39	Statement number 30. The librarian designs information systems to meet the needs of students and teachers	58
40	Statement number 31. The librarian helps students choose appropriate materials to meet learning needs	59
41	Statement number 32. The librarian teaches students how to use materials available in the library	59
42	Statement number 33. The librarian applies learning theories to the evaluation of materials for inclusion in the collection	59
43	Statement number 34. The librarian evaluates materials for inclusion in the collection by utilizing suggestions from administrators and teachers	59
44	Statement number 35. The librarian incorporates new production methods into the production of media	60
45	Statement number 36. The librarian uses the systems approach to the study and design of library services	61
46	Statement number 37. The librarian gathers statistical data for use in managing the library	61
47	Statement number 38. The librarian applies basic research data reported in the literature to the management of the library	61
48	Statement number 39. The librarian plans and conducts research projects to provide information for decision making	62

Table		Page
49	Statement number 40. The librarian reads professional publications to keep abreast of developments in the field	62
50	Results of analysis of variance between principals and librarians for statements in performance area II (actual and ideal condition)	63
51	Percentage of principals and librarians who perceive the actual condition for statements 42-45 at the 4 & 5 levels	65
52	Percentage of principals and librarians who perceive the ideal condition for statements 42-45 at the 4 & 5 levels	65
53	Results of analysis of variance between principals and librarians for statements in performance area II (actual condition)	67
	Results of analysis of variance between principals and librarians for statements in performance area II (ideal condition)	68
54	Frequency distribution for statement number 56: The librarian applies instructional design principles to the design of locally produced materials (actual condition)	70
55	Frequency distribution for statement number 56: The librarian applies instructional design principles to the design of locally produced materials (ideal condition)	71
56	Don't Know responses from all secondary principals and from all elementary principals on significant statements relating to the actual condition where the percentage rate exceeded 10 percent	73
57	Don't Know responses from all secondary librarians and from all elementary librarians on significant statements relating to the actual condition where the percentage rate exceeded 10 percent	74
58	Elementary librarians vs. secondary librarians: Results of analysis of variance of selected statements relating to "traditional" librarian activities (actual condition)	78
	Elementary librarians vs. secondary librarians: Results of analysis of variance of selected statements relating to "traditional" librarian activities (ideal condition)	79
59	Elementary librarians vs. secondary librarians: Analysis of variance of selected statements relating to management functions (actual condition)	83
	Elementary librarians vs. secondary librarians: Analysis of variance of selected statements relating to management functions (ideal condition)	84

Table		Page
60	Elementary librarians vs. secondary librarians: Results of analysis of variance on selected statements relating to local production (actual and ideal condition)	88
61	Urban elementary librarians vs. urban secondary librarians: Analysis of variance of selected statements (actual and ideal condition)	91
62	Librarians: large districts vs. small districts Results of analysis of variance Responsibility area (actual condition)	93
	Librarians: large districts vs. small districts Results of analysis of variance Responsibility area (ideal condition)	94
63	Librarians: large districts vs. small districts Results of analysis of variance Performance areas I, II, & III (actual condition)	97
	Librarians: large districts vs. small districts Results of analysis of variance Performance areas I, II, & III (ideal condition)	98
64	Elementary principals vs. secondary principals: Results of analysis of variance on selected statements in the responsibility area (actual condition)	101
	Elementary principals vs. secondary principals: Results of analysis of variance on selected statements in the responsibility area (ideal condition)	102
65	Elementary principals vs. secondary principals: Results of analysis of variance on selected statements in performance area I (actual condition)	107
	Elementary principals vs. secondary principals: Results of analysis of variance on selected statements in performance area I (ideal condition)	108
66	Elementary principals vs. secondary principals: Results of analysis of variance on selected statements in performance areas II & III (actual condition)	111
	Elementary principals vs. secondary principals: Results of analysis of variance on selected statements in performance areas II & III (ideal condition)	112

Table		Page
67	Urban elementary principals vs. urban secondary principals: Results of analysis of variance on selected statements (actual condition)	114
	Urban elementary principals vs. urban secondary principals Results of analysis of variance on selected statements (ideal condition)	115
68	Principals in large districts vs. principals in small districts Results of analysis of variance on selected statements in responsibility area (actual condition)	117
	Principals in large districts vs. principals in small districts Results of analysis of variance on selected statements in responsibility area (ideal condition)	118
69	Principals in large districts vs. principals in small districts Results of analysis of variance on selected statements in performance areas I & III (actual and ideal condition)	122
70	Principals in urban districts vs. principals in rural districts Results of analysis of variance on selected statements in the responsibility area (actual condition)	124
	Principals in urban districts vs. principals in rural districts Results of analysis of variance on selected statements in the responsibility area (ideal condition)	125
71	Principals in urban districts vs. principals in rural districts Results of analysis of variance on selected statements in performance areas I, II, & III (actual condition)	127
	Principals in urban districts vs. principals in rural districts Results of analysis of variance on selected statements in performance areas I, II, & III (ideal condition)	128

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

National standards for school media centers have received a great deal of attention during the past ten years, with new statements appearing in 1969 and 1975. During the same period state certification requirements for school media specialists have been examined, reviewed, and revised across the country.

As part of this movement, a completely new set of certification requirements for Campus-Level Learning Resources Specialists (school librarians, school media specialists), was adopted by the Texas State Board of Education in May, 1976. Texas' new certification requirements draw heavily from the 1975 national standards, Media Programs: District and School, and call for nearly every competency identified in the model recently developed by a committee of the American Association of School Librarians (AASL, 1976). The Texas certification plan is premised, then, on school situations with optimum program, funding, staffing, quarters, facilities and administrative support. Since media personnel educated in Texas should be prepared to function in the best of Learning Resources Centers in Texas and across the country, the high expectations are quite appropriate. Upgrading and modernizing the requirements for newly certified Learning Resources Specialists does present problems, however. The gap between the ideal upon which the new preparation is based and the "real world" of school media centers will become wider in most cases, and the need for in-service education more pronounced. School district media supervisors, state education agency personnel and others responsible for continuing education of school personnel will need to increase their efforts to identify the areas in greatest need of improvement and plan programs accordingly.

Changed certification requirements will also necessitate thoughtful and active responses from academic institutions which provide pre-service education. Educators, for example, will need to re-assess the information they give to prospective school media specialists regarding superintendents' and principals' views of what media specialists ought to be doing. But is a principal a principal a principal? Or, for example, will the expectations of elementary principals differ from those of secondary principals?

And what about those preparing for positions as superintendents, principals, or teachers? They too should have up-to-date information about actual and desirable roles and functions of school media specialists. School administrators could use data of the kind available from the study reported here to compare their current activities and future plans with norms for similar school systems. Reality-based norms would help them set priorities when they prepare budgets, rationalize staffing, assess the adequacy of learning resources collections, and make other management decisions.

Review of Related Literature

Standards and Certification.--The major survey instrument for this study was based on Preparation Program for the Education of the Campus-Level Learning Resources Specialist (school librarian), the state certification plan recently adopted by the Texas State Board of Education (Prep. Program..., 1975). Two sets of recently developed standards are important to this study, since they served as basic resource documents for the committee which prepared the certification proposal. Media Programs: District and School provides guidelines and recommendations for school library media programs of superior quality and serves as the current national model (AASL and AECT, 1975). Guidelines for the

Development of Campus Learning Resources Centers (Librarians), published in 1974 by the Texas Education Agency, provides similar guidelines at the state level (TEA, 1974). These sources are not research, of course, neither do they represent the extant literature on standards and certification. They are included because of their basic relationship to this research project.

Functions of the school library.--A study of major importance is the Library Manpower Project funded by the Knapp Foundation. The results of this study included identification of twelve categories of 300 tasks performed by various school library personnel (School Library Manpower Project, 1970); definitions for school library personnel with specifications for competencies necessary to carry out the functions described in the definitions (Case, 1973); and a survey of six university level experimental programs for School Library Media Education (School Library Manpower Project, 1974). Other studies that deal with functions of the school library and/or the position of the library in the total school program are Gaver, 1971; Gaver and Jones, 1966; Liesener, 1972; Lohrer, 1970; Office of Education, 1973; Ricking, 1974; and Smith, 1956.

Perceptions of the librarian's role.--Anderson's research on the role of the school librarian as perceived by the librarians, teachers, and principals in Oregon high schools concluded that the three groups do not perceive the librarian's role in the same way (Anderson, 1970). Olson conducted a similar survey in the Minneapolis-St. Paul area and reached the same conclusion (Olson, 1966). The only study identified which attempted to determine the future roles and functions of school librarians was Jetter's Delphi study of the opinions of fifty-three leaders prominent in professional specializations (Jetter, 1972). Jetter's major finding was that librarians would be working much more with curriculum and teachers in the future.

Although these studies indicate a definite variance in the perceptions of the librarian's role by librarians, principals, and teachers and give some general notion of future directions, none speaks directly to conditions in Texas; not one studies superintendents as a basic group; and none attempts to determine whether perceptions of librarian's roles and functions differ in large and small school districts in rural and urban districts, and in elementary and secondary schools.

Description of the Study

Research Hypotheses

This study was designed to establish the perceptions of current and desired roles and functions of the librarian[1] by seeking information from school superintendents, principals, and librarians. Three basic hypotheses were considered in the attempt to determine these perceptions:

Null Hypothesis 1.--H_o: No significant rank difference exists between the librarian's roles and functions considered desirable by superintendents and those considered desirable by librarians.

Null Hypothesis 2.--H_o: No significant rank difference exists between the librarian's roles and functions considered desirable by principals and those considered desirable by librarians.

Null Hypothesis 3.--H_o: No significant rank difference exists between the librarian's roles and functions considered desirable by superintendents and those considered desirable by principals.

---

[1]A decision was made to use the term "librarian" because that is the term commonly used by Texas school personnel and was the language used in Texas certification guidelines at the time of the study.

The following related hypotheses were also tested:

Null Hypothesis 4.--H_o: No significant rank difference exists between the librarian's roles and functions considered desirable by superintendents in urban schools and those considered desirable by superintendents in rural schools.

Null Hypothesis 5.--H_o: No significant rank difference exists between the librarian's roles and functions considered desirable by superintendents in large school districts and those considered desirable by superintendents in small school districts.

Null Hypothesis 6.--H_o: No significant rank difference exists between the librarian's roles and functions considered desirable by all secondary school principals and those considered desirable by all elementary school principals.

Null Hypothesis 7.--H_o: No significant rank difference exists between the librarian's roles and functions considered desirable by urban secondary school principals and those considered desirable by urban elementary school principals.

Null Hypothesis 8.--H_o: No significant rank difference exists between the librarian's roles and functions considered desirable by principals of large school districts and those considered desirable by principals of small school districts.

Null Hypothesis 9.--H_o: No significant rank difference exists between the librarian's roles and functions considered desirable by all urban school principals and those considered desirable by all rural school principals.

Null Hypothesis 10.--H_o: No significant rank difference exists between the librarian's roles and functions considered desirable by all secondary school librarians and those considered desirable by all elementary school librarians.

Null Hypothesis 11.--H_o: No significant rank difference exists between the librarian's roles and functions considered desirable by urban secondary school librarians and those considered desirable by urban elementary school librarians.

Null Hypothesis 12.--H_o: No significant rank difference exists between the librarian's roles and functions considered desirable by librarians of large school districts and those considered desirable by librarians of small school districts.

Research Process

An *ex post facto* study was conducted, and the data collected were used to measure and correlate the variates and criterion variables inherent in the Texas Preparation Program for the Education of the Campus Level Learning Resources Specialist (school librarian). The criterion variable (opinion of the roles and functions of the school librarian considered desirable) was examined in relation to the following variate: perception of the current roles and functions of the school librarian.

Both the criterion variable and the variate were ranked by school superintendents, school principals, and school librarians. One-way analysis of variance and Fisher's correlated T-Test were applied and interpreted according to standard statistical sources. Level of significance was set at .05.

Procedures

1. Co-sponsorship of the study by Region 10 Education Service Center and by Region XI Education Service Center was obtained. Personnel from the two Centers were then consulted on the structure of the questionnaire, appropriate pilot study locations, and the general research design.

2. A discrepancy analysis survey instrument was prepared, modeled on the Richardson (Texas) Independent School District's Needs Assessment of Guidance/Counselling Service. This instrument has two six-point scales for the representation of opinions. The first (left-hand) scale is designed to elicit information on the perceived present status of an activity; the second (right-hand) scale seeks an indication of the desired status for the same activity. Survey items were based on the model of the recommended functions to be performed by the Learning Resources Specialist (school librarian) in the Texas Council on Library Education's Preparation Program for the Education of the Campus-Level Learning Resources Specialist. (See Appendix I for a copy of the survey instrument.)

3. Appropriate cover letters were prepared for mailing to superintendents, principals, and librarians (see Appendix I).

4. A pilot study was conducted in two urban and two rural Texas school districts outside the universe of the study reported here to determine whether revision was needed and to check the suitability of the proposed data analysis.

5. For those districts in which it could be determined that there was a district level media supervisor (library consultant, library director), contact was initiated with the supervisor, who then acted as the spokesperson in attempting to obtain the participation of, and authorization from, the superintendent of that district. A mailing was sent to the remaining superintendents in Region Service Centers Ten and Eleven[2] requesting their personal participation in the survey and their authorization to mail the questionnaire to principals and librarians in their districts. Responses were received from 72 of 164 (43.90%) of the superintendents.

---

[2]See "Definition of Terms" for descriptions of Regional Service Centers Ten and Eleven.

6. After authorizations were received from superintendents, questionnaires were distributed by district level supervisors or mailed on a common date to principals and librarians. To insure confidentiality, each questionnaire was accompanied by a postpaid return envelope addressed to Pfister at NTSU. Responses were received from 418 of 708 (59.04%) of the principals and 324 of an estimated 520 librarians (62.31%). An estimate was necessary for librarians since no accurate directory was available, and some librarians serving multiple campuses received more than one questionnaire.

7. Responses were key-punched as they were received and computed after the closeout date of March 2, 1976.

8. Ten urban and six rural superintendents were identified by drawing a stratified random sample from participating districts. All sixteen superintendents were asked to give individual interviews (or designate an assistant to do so) in order to obtain reaction and comment on the major findings of the survey and to receive their advisement on recommended actions for reducing discrepancies between current and desired roles and functions of school librarians.

9. Preliminary assessments of findings were made.

10. Interviews with fourteen superintendents (eight urban and six rural) were conducted.

11. Final assessments were made, and reports were prepared on the study and its findings.

Definition of Terms

Education Service Center.--see Regional Service Center.

Elementary school.--any school serving grades K-6 or any portion thereof.

Instructional design.--the formulation and selection of management systems for instructional development (AASL and AECT, 1975: p. 112).

Instructional development.--the solution of instructional problems through the design and application of instructional systems and their components (AASL and AECT, 1975: p. 113).

Large school district.--any district having ten (10) or more campuses.

Learning Resources Center (LRC).--the functional unit providing for an organized collection of print materials, audiovisual materials and their related devices with the services of a staff qualified to provide and facilitate the use of these materials and devices as required to meet the varied needs of students and faculty. (Also called Library, Instructional Materials Center, Educational Media Center, Library Media Center, and other variants.) (Prep program..., 1975: 7).

Learning Resources Specialist.--a new and unique professional position which implies more than a change in title, and more than the sum total of the traditional concepts of "library" and "audio-visual". The position is evidence of a fundamental change in services and utilization of resources, developed in response to new patterns of learning, curricula and administration, and the continuing impact of technology.

The Learning Resources Specialist (LRS) is an individual who has developed knowledge and understanding of, and competencies in, the expanded range of media services, with particular emphasis on the development, administration and implementation of a unified learning resources program. The LRS may also have developed advanced competencies in a specific area of the learning resources program, i.e., educational research, administration, information science, curriculum, educational broadcasting and other educational specializations (Prep Program..., 1975: 7).

Region 10 Education Service Center.--serves eight counties, 81 school districts, and about 375,000 school children. Haydn Goodgion, Executive Director, 400 Spring Valley Road, Richardson, Texas 75080.

Region XI Education Service Center.--serves ten counties, 83 school districts, and about 214,500 school children. R. P. Campbell, Jr., Executive Director, 2821 Cullen Street, Fort Worth, Texas 76107.

Regional Service Center.--provides support for media, computer, consultant services, and other resources in support of local school districts. The state of Texas is divided into twenty regions, each with a Regional Service Center funded by federal, state, and local sources (also known as Education Service Center).

Rural school district.--any school district located in a county not designated as urban according to Statistical Abstracts of the United States, 1973.

Secondary school.--any school serving grades 7-12 or any combination thereof.

Small school district.--any district having 1-9 campus units.

Urban school district.--any school district located in a county designated as urban according to the Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area listings in Statistical Abstracts of the United States, 1973.

CHAPTER II

RESPONSIBILITY

Introduction

This chapter provides data on the responses made to role and function statements one through twenty-three by 72 superintendents, 418 principals and 324 librarians. These twenty-three statements represent responsibility as opposed to performance areas for campus level media center personnel. The purpose of the study was to measure perceptions of current and desired levels of performance. The survey was introduced to respondents through an appropriate cover letter (see Appendix I). Respondents were asked to indicate for each statement: "(1) your perception of the actual condition in your school or district in the left hand scale, and (2) your judgment as to the ideal condition for that role or function in the right hand scale." Response categories for the responsibility section are: 0 (zero) = Don't Know; 1 = Has Little or No Responsibility; 2 = Has Some Responsibility; 3 = Has Considerable Responsibility; 4 = Has Much Responsibility; 5 = Has Complete Responsibility.

Because of the variations in terminology--e.g. media specialist, learning resources specialist, librarian--a decision was made to use the term "librarian" which was in accord with the then current language of Texas certification and is the term commonly used by superintendents, principals, and indeed, the librarians themselves.

Data Analysis

Data from returns was analyzed as follows:

1. Frequency distribution tables were prepared for each group, showing number and percent of non-response (Blanks), as well as number and

percent for the six response categories. These tables are not reproduced in this report.

2. The T-Test for Correlated Samples was made for each respondent group to compare actual and ideal perceptions on each of the statements. Blanks were eliminated; zeroes (Don't Know) were included in T-Test calculations.

3. A one-way analysis of variance test was made between responses of superintendents and those of librarians, between superintendents and principals, between principals and librarians, and between a number of sub-groups to be discussed in subsequent chapters. Both blanks and zeroes were excluded from analysis of variance calculations.[1]

4. For those items where analysis of variance showed a significant difference at the .05 or greater level, supplementary frequency distributions were prepared to permit examination of percentages when blanks and zeroes had been excluded. Only a selection of these tables is included in this report.

5. Summary tables were constructed to facilitate reporting normative and comparative data for each of the fifty-seven statements on the questionnaire. Each summary table gives the text of the role or function statement; the means for actual conditions and for ideal conditions

---

[1]One of the assumptions of the analysis of variance (ANOVA) model is that the x populations being tested have equal variances. The Bartlett test of homogeneity of variance, an all purpose test, was used to determine whether the assumption of equality of variances was met for ANOVA. Where the assumption of equality of variances was not met for ANOVA in a given comparison, the affected statistic will be omitted. We are indebted to Sandra Kincaid, Dept. of Labor Statistician, Dallas Regional Office, for assistance on this point.

for superintendents,[1] for principals, and for librarians; and p, the analysis of variance statistic.

Findings--T-Test for Correlated Samples

The T-Test for correlated samples between the actual and ideal rankings revealed a highly significant difference in each of the three groups for every role and function statement. In the case of the principals the difference on this item and for all others in this section was significant at the 0.0000 level. Although not always so highly significant, T-Test results for librarians and for superintendents also indicated highly significant differences between actual and ideal conditions on every item. Correlated T-Test data are shown in Appendix II.

The succinctness with which the T-Test results can be reported here does not mean that they are unimportant. Superintendents, principals, and librarians are in agreement that there is not one role or function among those included which is now being carried out as well as it should be.

Findings--Analysis of Variance

Formulating long range plans.--No statistically significant difference was found to exist between any of the three groups. The librarians are uniformly perceived as having considerable actual responsibility for long range planning, with the desired ideal over half a step above the actual condition (see table 1).

Preparing the educational specifications for new facilities.--The perceptions of the actual situation are of particular interest here. Keep in mind that we are examining the rankings assigned to librarian responsibility, as seen by each of

---

[1]Superintendents responded to items 1 through 23 only; thus Chapter III, which reports on items 24 through 57 includes no superintendent information.

TABLE 1

Results of one-way analysis of variance for statement number 1: The librarian has responsibility for formulating long range plans for the library.

CONDITION	MEANS		p
	Supt.	Libn.	
Actual	3.28169	3.02484	.1018
Ideal	3.80000	3.92236	.1535

	Libn.	Prin.	
Actual	3.02484	3.06601	.6283
Ideal	3.92236	3.66667	*

	Supt.	Prin.	
Actual	3.28169	3.06601	.1163
Ideal	3.80000	3.66667	.1890

* Statistic not used. See note, p. 12.

the three groups. Librarians perceived their own actual responsibility at a significantly lower level than did the principals, who in turn, ranked librarian responsibility significantly lower than did the superintendents (see table 2). However one may wish to speculate on the rationale for this somewhat surprising progression, the implications for librarians seem clear. Administrators at both building and district levels see more opportunity for librarians to assume responsibility than librarians in this study have been willing (able?) to assume for themselves. The opportunity to assume added responsibility is there now, and administrators' perceptions of the ideal condition would call for even greater involvement of librarians in planning for new or remodeled facilities.

Planning floor design, furnishings.--Once again the means for perceptions of actual responsibility levels follow a librarian--principal--superintendent low to high progression of 2.06738 to 2.27249 to 2.78261. The difference between each step is significant, and the implications are similar to those for involvement in planning new or remodeled facilities--the door is open if the librarians will take advantage of the opportunity. As for the ideal, principals and superintendents show no significant difference in their means of 3.38480 and 3.55714; librarians are significantly higher ($p=.0487$) than the superintendents in their perception of the ideal (see table 3).

About one of eight librarians (12.65%) and one of twelve principals (8.37%) responded "Don't Know" to the actual condition, which may indicate lack of experience with this activity.

Planning facilities for local design and production.--Once again, librarians perceive their level of responsibility at a level significantly lower than do the administrators (see table 4).

TABLE 2

Results of one-way analysis of variance for statement number 2: When new or remodeled library plan facilities are needed, the librarian has responsibility for preparing the educational specifications for them.

CONDITION	MEANS		p
	Supt.	Libn.	
Actual	2.91429	2.15734	.0000*
Ideal	3.69565	3.76563	.4662

	Libn.	Prin.	
Actual	2.15734	2.40360	.0088*
Ideal	3.76563	3.44853	**

	Supt.	Prin.	
Actual	2.91429	2.40360	.0010*
Ideal	3.69565	3.44853	.0219*

* Significant at the .05 or greater level.
** Statistic not used. See note, p. 12.

TABLE 3

Results of one-way analysis of variance for statement number 3: When new or remodeled library facilities are planned, the librarian has responsibility for planning for the floor design, furnishings, etc.

CONDITION	MEANS		p
	Supt.	Libn.	
Actual	2.78261	2.06738	.0000*
Ideal	3.55714	3.75701	.0487*

	Libn.	Prin.	
Actual	2.06738	2.27249	.0313*
Ideal	3.75701	3.38480	**

	Supt.	Prin.	
Actual	2.78261	2.27249	.0013*
Ideal	3.55714	3.38480	.1240

* Significant at the .05 or greater level.
** Statistic not used. See note, p. 12.

TABLE 4

Results of one-way analysis of variance for statement number 4: The librarian has responsibility for planning facilities for local design and production of learning resources.

CONDITION	MEANS		p
	Supt.	Libn.	
Actual	2.78571	1.95470	.0000*
Ideal	3.44928	3.37785	.5681

	Libn.	Prin.	
Actual	1.95470	2.33161	.0000*
Ideal	3.37785	3.33750	.5630

	Supt.	Prin.	
Actual	2.78571	2.33161	.0031*
Ideal	3.44928	3.33750	.3477

* Difference significant at the .05 or greater level

The frequency distribution presented in Table 5 shows this clearly, especially on the 1 (Little or No Responsibility) line. There one finds 49.83% of librarians, only 30.57% of the principals, and much lower still, 18.57% of the superintendents.

Preparing proposals for obtaining outside funds.--The pattern observed earlier is maintained in the perceptions of the librarian's responsibility for preparing proposals for outside funds. Superintendents and principals both ranked the actual level of responsibility assigned to librarians for this activity at a significantly higher level than librarians did (see table 6). The librarian was rather uniformly perceived as having considerable responsibility (3.0) at the ideal level. Superintendent interviews indicated that campus level librarians were expected to provide input for proposals for ESEA Title IV proposals, sharing responsibility with principals and (where available) school library supervisors. Superintendents did not see the actual preparation of proposals as a campus level responsibility, however.

Obtaining resources from beyond the local campus.--Statements 6, 7, and 8 ask for response on three facets of the campus level librarian's responsibility for providing coordination with, and access to, resources from beyond the local campus. All three major hypotheses of the study were supported for each item on both the actual and the ideal perception; i.e., there were no significant differences in rankings of an item by superintendents, principals, and librarians. Comparison of the actual means for statement 6, coordinating deliveries and returns from the school district center, with the actual means for items 7 and 8 shows that librarians are now performing best between the campus and the local district center. The actual means for item 6 are higher, and the discrepancies between actual and ideal are smaller, than for items 7 and 8 (see tables 7, 8, and 9).

TABLE 5

Frequency distribution for statement number 4: The librarian has responsibility for planning facilities for local design and production of learning resources.

Actual Condition

RESPONSE CATEGORY	LIBRARIANS		PRINCIPALS		SUPERINTENDENTS	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
No Response	5	*	8	*	0	*
0 Don't Know	32	*	24	*	2	*
1 Little or No Responsibility	143	49.83	118	30.57	13	18.57
2 Some Responsibility	64	22.30	115	29.79	16	22.86
3 Considerable Responsibility	39	13.59	69	17.88	20	28.57
4 Much Responsibility	32	11.15	75	19.43	15	21.43
5 Complete Responsibility	9	3.14	9	2.33	6	8.57

* Non-responses and zero (Don't Know) responses were not used in analysis or variance computations.

TABLE 6

Results of one-way analysis of variance for statement number 5: When funds are available from sources outside the local district, the librarian has responsibility for preparing proposals for obtaining them.

CONDITION	MEANS		p
	Supt.	Libn.	
Actual	2.0588	1.78313	.0113*
Ideal	3.12121	2.99317	.4038

	Libn.	Prin.	
Actual	1.78313	1.96020	.0040*
Ideal	2.99317	3.01320	.6899

	Supt.	Prin.	
Actual	2.0588	1.96020	.4794
Ideal	3.12121	3.01320	.5517

* Significant at the .05 or greater level.

TABLE 7

Results of one-way analysis of variance for statement number 6: The librarian has responsibility for coordinating deliveries and returns of materials from the school district's center. (Answer only if your district maintains a district learning resources center.)

CONDITION	MEANS		p
	Supt.	Libn.	
Actual	3.56250	3.28571	.5170
Ideal	4.2000	3.64390	.1240

	Libn.	Prin.	
Actual	3.28571	3.41392	.3787
Ideal	3.64390	3.82117	.1347

	Supt.	Prin.	
Actual	3.56250	3.41392	.6997
Ideal	4.2000	3.82117	.2328

TABLE 8

Results of one-way analysis of variance for statement number 7: The librarian has responsibility for coordinating deliveries and returns of materials from the regional service center.

CONDITION	MEANS		p
	Supt.	Libn.	
Actual	2.21212	2.57966	.1068
Ideal	3.31148	3.11824	.3735

	Libn.	Prin.	
Actual	2.57966	2.61867	.7635
Ideal	3.11824	3.30311	.1107

	Supt.	Prin.	
Actual	2.21212	2.61867	.0618
Ideal	3.31148	3.30311	.9675

TABLE 9

Results of one-way analysis of variance for statement number 8: The librarian has responsibility for providing for use of materials from outside the school by activities such as Inter-library Loan and maintaining a community resources file.

CONDITION	MEANS		p
	Supt.	Libn.	
Actual	2.35385	2.5000	.4771
Ideal	3.65079	3.42193	.1925

	Libn.	Prin.	
Actual	2.5000	2.39779	.3733
Ideal	3.42193	3.42377	.9845

	Supt.	Prin.	
Actual	2.35385	2.39779	.8168
Ideal	3.65079	3.42377	.1662

There is an apparent opportunity for greater activity on the part of librarians who are willing to serve as a link to outside information and instructional resources. Professional expertise is clearly needed in this area to perform a service which can often be offered without significant budget increases. A question on the librarian's role in this area was posed for the superintendent interviews and is discussed in chapter six.

Designing and conducting in-service programs for teachers.--The low level of responsibility for teacher in-service perceived by all groups for both actual and ideal scales is quite surprising (see table 10). There is food for thought here for those involved in pre-service education who place high value and considerable emphasis on the school media specialist's role in in-service for teachers. The situation seems to call for some caveats from library school instructors to neophyte librarians. Those entering the profession should be made aware of possible reluctance on the part of school personnel to view this activity as an area of high priority, or even of legitimate concern, for the librarian.

Providing in-service education for staff.--While the ideal rankings showed some variation and a statistically significant difference between principals and librarians, all ideal rankings exceeded the 4.0 level (see table 11).

The frequency distributions for the actual rankings given in table 12 show a wide difference in percentages on the 5 (Complete Responsibility) line with over 50% of the librarians claiming complete responsibility, but only 35% of the principals and less than 10% of the superintendents seeing the librarian assuming complete responsibility under actual conditions. The 1 line is also of interest, since 14.01% (nearly one of seven) of the librarians perceive themselves as having little or no responsibility in this area. Do they have no staff, does their staff not need in-service education, or is someone else responsible?

TABLE 10

Results of one-way analysis of variance for statement number 9: The librarian has responsibility for designing and conducting in-service training programs for teachers.

CONDITION	MEANS		p
	Supt.	Libn.	
Actual	1.63768	1.64650	.9467
Ideal	2.41791	2.58147	.2715

	Libn.	Prin.	
Actual	1.64650	1.79208	.0561
Ideal	2.58147	2.58008	.9943

	Supt.	Prin.	
Actual	1.63768	1.79208	.2401
Ideal	2.41791	2.58088	.2571

TABLE 11

Results of one-way analysis of variance for statement number 10: The librarian has responsibility for providing in-service education for the library staff (including volunteers).

CONDITION	MEANS		p
	Supt.	Libn.	
Actual	3.34328	3.86645	.0110*
Ideal	4.22727	4.36129	.3081

	Libn.	Prin.	
Actual	3.86645	3.60354	.0178*
Ideal	4.36129	4.12871	.0022*

	Supt.	Prin.	
Actual	3.34328	3.60354	.1651
Ideal	4.22727	4.12871	.4490

* Significant at the .05 or greater level.

TABLE 12

Frequency distribution for statement number 10: The librarian has responsibility for providing in-service education for the library staff (including volunteers).

Actual Condition

RESPONSE CATEGORY	LIBRARIANS		PRINCIPALS		SUPERINTENDENTS	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
No Response	8	*	10	*	0	*
0 Don't Know	9	*	12	*	2	*
1 Little or No Responsibility	43	14.01	52	13.13	13	19.40
2 Some Responsibility	32	10.42	43	10.86	16	23.88
3 Considerable Responsibility	23	7.49	57	14.39	20	29.85
4 Much Responsibility	34	11.07	102	25.76	15	22.39
5 Complete Responsibility	175	57.00	142	35.86	6	8.96

* Non-responses and zero (Don't Know) responses were not used in analysis or variance computations.

Producing materials.--The rankings assigned to this function by principals were significantly higher than those given to it by librarians on both the actual and ideal scales (see table 13). Superintendents and principals agreed that ideally librarians would assume considerable responsibility (3.0) for local production of materials; the actual condition is seen as near the some (2.0) level.

Teaching students to produce audio-visual materials.--There was agreement, without significant differences between groups, that librarians currently have little responsibility for teaching students how to produce audio-visual materials. The mean for the ideal level, as perceived by each of the three groups, was a full step or more above the actual level, with no significant difference between any of the groups. This would indicate that, given funding and librarian expertise adequate to do the teaching, considerable progress could be made in this service area (see table 14).

Developing listening, viewing, and responding skills of students.--A generally low level of responsibility for both actual and ideal is seen by all three groups (see table 15). The low rankings reflect an attitude that librarians occupy a supportive, rather than an integral, role in basic instructional areas such as developing listening, viewing, and responding skills. This seems to be another professional role which could be assumed by librarians who are willing to promote the use of existing resources in cooperation with classroom teachers. Certainly an area so basic to student instruction is in need of attention when 45.59% of responding superintendents, 34.06% of principals, and 43.09% of librarians indicate that librarians currently assume little or no responsibility for it.[1]

---

[1]These percentages were taken from statistical tables which have not been included in this report.

TABLE 13

Results of one-way analysis of variance for statement number 11: The librarian has responsibility for campus level production of materials that aid teachers in the classroom.

CONDITION	MEANS		p
	Supt.	Libn.	
Actual	2.08696	1.96154	.4297
Ideal	3.04478	2.79487	.1189

	Libn.	Prin.	
Actual	1.96154	2.21182	.0058*
Ideal	2.79487	3.12069	.0002*

	Supt.	Prin.	
Actual	2.08696	2.21182	.4332
Ideal	3.04478	3.12069	.6232

* Significant at the .05 or greater level.

TABLE 14

Results of one-way analysis of variance for statement number 12: The librarian has responsibility for teaching students how to produce audio-visual materials.

CONDITION	MEANS		p
	Supt.	Libn.	
Actual	1.56923	1.77419	.2083
Ideal	2.84615	2.80528	.8064

	Libn.	Prin.	
Actual	1.77419	1.85642	.3689
Ideal	2.80528	2.90226	.2904

	Supt.	Prin.	
Actual	1.56923	1.85642	.0635
Ideal	2.84615	2.90226	.7266

TABLE 15

Results of one-way analysis of variance for statement number 13: The librarian has responsibility for developing the listening, viewing, and responding skills of students.

CONDITION	MEANS		p
	Supt.	Libn.	
Actual	1.79104	1.94603	.2639
Ideal	2.70313	2.61093	.5278

	Libn.	Prin.	
Actual	1.94603	2.06234	.1346
Ideal	2.61093	2.78713	.0272*

	Supt.	Prin.	
Actual	1.79104	2.06234	.0405*
Ideal	2.70313	2.78713	.5559

*Significant at the .05 or greater level.

It has been suggested that the questionnaire statement should have read, "The librarian has responsibility for helping teachers develop the listening, viewing, and responding skills of students." Perhaps this is correct; the competency statement in the certification guidelines model from which this item was derived reads, "Facilitate viewing, listening, reading and responding skills of students and teachers." There is warrant for the present wording, however, if one considers such parent statements as the following from Media Programs: District and School (AASL and AECT, 1975:53):

> "The media staff draws upon the expertise provided by their training and experience to enable learners to acquire research skills and reading, viewing, and listening techniques that enhance their ability to select and use media. This is a special and unique contribution that media professionals make to students at every maturity level."

In addition, the AASL Certification Model for Professional School Media Personnel (AASL, 1976:14) lists among its competencies for utilization of media "d. Provide guidance in reading, listening, and viewing experiences for students and teachers."

Developing reading and responding skills.--The low means for the actual conditions (see table 16) are a function of the high percentages of respondents who perceive the librarians as having little or no current responsibility for developing reading and responding skills--32 of the superintendents (44.44%), 175 of the principals (41.87%), and 133 of the librarians (41.05%).

Even at the ideal level the response rate for the Little or No Responsibility category was 15 for superintendents (20.83%), 74 for principals (17.70%), and 56 for librarians (17.28%).[1] As shown in chapter four, the view that librarians have little or no responsibility for developing reading and responding skills is stronger in secondary schools than in elementary schools.

---

[1]See note, page 29.

TABLE 16

Results of one-way analysis of variance for statement number 14: The librarian has responsibility for developing the reading and responding skills of students.

CONDITION	MEANS		p
	Supt.	Libn.	
Actual	1.72464	1.91429	.1315
Ideal	2.44776	2.46429	.9055

	Libn.	Prin.	
Actual	1.91429	1.84938	.3578
Ideal	2.46429	2.51225	.5362

	Supt.	Prin.	
Actual	1.72464	1.84938	.2855
Ideal	2.44776	2.51225	.6411

Comparison of tables 15 and 16 shows that all three groups ranked the librarian's responsibility for developing listening, viewing, and responding skills at somewhat higher levels than their rankings for developing reading and responding skills.

Selecting materials and related equipment.--Statements 15, 16, 17, and 18 deal with various aspects of responsibility for selecting materials and related equipment. As one might expect, the highest level for both the actual and the ideal scales was on the function traditionally associated with librarians: statement sixteen, formulating and recommending selection policies for print materials. All group means exceeded 3.5 on the actual scale, and only the principals' mean of 3.96845 fell below 4.0 on the ideal scale (see table 18). Librarians perceived both actual and ideal responsibilities for selecting print materials at a significantly higher level than principals did. This may mean that librarians should give more consideration to the need for sharing responsibility for developing and implementing selection policies.

Next highest means were for statement 18, responsibility for making adequate provisions for previewing materials. Here, as in statement 16, we have an area of responsibility which has traditionally been regarded as proper for the librarian. It is ranked without significant difference of opinion between groups in every case except that the ideal perceptions of librarians were significantly higher than were those of the principals (see table 20).

Means for the actual conditions and, in general, for the ideal were lower still on statement 15, selecting audio-visual materials (see table 17). The lowest means of the four selection areas appear on statement 17, evaluating and selecting audio-visual equipment (see table 19). Selection of audio-visual

TABLE 17

Results of one-way analysis of variance for statement number 15: The librarian has responsibility for formulating and recommending for adoption policies for the evaluation and selection of audio-visual materials for the collection.

CONDITION	MEANS		p
	Supt.	Libn.	
Actual	2.60870	2.88088	.1526
Ideal	3.39706	3.76415	.0033*

	Libn.	Prin.	
Actual	2.88088	2.65586	**
Ideal	3.76415	3.34063	.0000*

	Supt.	Prin.	
Actual	3.60870	2.65586	.7667
Ideal	3.39706	3.34063	.6605

* Significant at the .05 or greater level.
** Statistic not used. See note, p. 12.

TABLE 18

Results of one-way analysis of variance for statement number 16: The librarian has responsibility for formulating and recommending for adoption policies for the evaluation and selection of library books, periodicals, and other print materials for the collection.

CONDITION	MEANS		p
	Supt.	Libn.	
Actual	3.76812	3.93189	.2983
Ideal	4.17647	4.24611	.4830

	Libn.	Prin.	
Actual	3.93189	3.51214	.0000*
Ideal	4.24611	3.96845	.0000*

	Supt.	Prin.	
Actual	3.76812	3.51214	.0866
Ideal	4.17647	3.96845	.0463*

* Significant at the .05 or greater level.

TABLE 19

Results of one-way analysis of variance for statement number 17: The librarian has responsibility for evaluating and selecting audio-visual equipment.

CONDITION	MEANS		p
	Supt.	Libn.	
Actual	2.44118	2.44828	.9691
Ideal	3.07576	3.52866	.0006*

	Libn.	Prin.	
Actual	2.44828	2.56934	.2164
Ideal	3.52866	3.21550	.0000*

	Supt.	Prin.	
Actual	2.44118	2.56934	.4291
Ideal	3.07576	3.21550	.3043

* Significant at the .05 or greater level.

TABLE 20

Results of one-way analysis of variance for statement number 18: The librarian has responsibility for making adequate provision for previewing materials being considered for the collection.

CONDITION	MEANS		p
	Supt.	Libn.	
Actual	3.21429	2.86076	.0582
Ideal	3.79412	3.76508	.8218

	Libn.	Prin.	
Actual	2.86076	2.90799	.6426
Ideal	3.76508	3.59903	.0229*

	Supt.	Prin.	
Actual	3.2142	2.90799	.0607
Ideal	3.79412	3.59903	.1161

* Significant at the .05 or greater level.

equipment and materials is apparently less recognized as the proper province of librarians than is the selection of print materials. The ideal rankings of librarians were significantly higher than the rankings of principals and superintendents on statements 15 and 17.

Since responsibility for audio-visual materials and equipment is so pivotal to the concept of the unified learning resources program being developed in Texas and elsewhere, the frequency distributions for perceptions of the ideal condition on statements 15 and 17 are presented in tables 21 and 22.

These tables show quite clearly that even though a small minority perceives little or no librarian responsibility in these two areas, the majority of administrators as well as librarians would ideally prefer to see librarians assume "Much" or even "Complete" responsibility. Since there is increasing support for this view from national and state levels, it will become more and more important for librarians to develop the skill and the will to assume responsibility where the propensity to delegate it to them already exists.

Developing and implementing acquisition procedures.--Statements 19, 20, and 21 concern areas of acquisition. Here, as in the hierarchy that emerged for areas of selection, the highest rankings were assigned to the librarian's responsibility for developing and implementing procedures for acquisition of print materials (statement 19); the next higher rankings were for acquisition of audio-visual materials (statement 20); and the lowest rankings of the three were given to responsibility for acquiring audio-visual equipment (statement 21). Superintendents, principals, and librarians all ranked the three statements in the same order. Thus, even though the librarians were significantly higher in a number of their rankings than superintendents and principals, particularly on the ideal condition, there was no conflict on the relative positions of the three acquisition areas (see tables 23, 24, and 25).

TABLE 21

Frequency distribution for statement number 15: The librarian has responsibility for formulating and recommending for adoption policies for the evaluation and selection of audio-visual materials for the collection.

Ideal Condition

RESPONSE CATEGORY	LIBRARIANS		PRINCIPALS		SUPERINTENDENTS	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
No Response	5	*	2	*	4	*
0 Don't Know	1	*	5	*	0	*
1 Little or No Responsibility	7	2.20	14	3.35	2	2.94
2 Some Responsibility	28	8.81	77	18.42	12	17.65
3 Considerable Responsibility	52	16.35	105	25.12	19	27.94
4 Much Responsibility	177	55.66	185	44.26	27	39.71
5 Complete Responsibility	54	16.90	30	7.18	8	11.76

* Non-responses and zero (Don't Know) responses were not used in analysis or variance computations.

TABLE 22

Frequency distribution for statement number 17: The librarian has responsibility for evaluating and selecting audio-visual equipment.

Ideal Condition

RESPONSE CATEGORY	LIBRARIANS		PRINCIPALS		SUPERINTENDENTS	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
No Response	6	*	3	*	6	*
0 Don't Know	4	*	2	*	0	*
1 Little or No Responsibility	8	2.55	30	7.26	3	4.55
2 Some Responsibility	43	13.69	69	16.71	18	27.27
3 Considerable Responsibility	75	23.89	120	29.06	20	30.30
4 Much Responsibility	151	48.09	170	41.16	21	31.82
5 Complete Responsibility	37	11.78	24	5.81	4	6.06

* Non-responses and zero (Don't Know) responses were not used in analysis or variance computations.

TABLE 23

Results of one-way analysis of variance for statement number 19: The librarian has responsibility for developing and implementing procedures for acquisition (by purchase, exchange, or gift) of print materials.

CONDITION	MEANS		p
	Supt.	Libn.	
Actual	3.08571	3.60952	.0045*
Ideal	3.52941	4.06940	.0000*

	Libn.	Prin.	
Actual	3.60952	2.91646	.0000*
Ideal	4.06940	3.47750	. **

	Supt.	Prin.	
Actual	3.08571	2.91646	.3272
Ideal	3.52941	3.47750	.7109

* Significant at the .05 or greater level.
** Statistic not used. See note, page 12.

TABLE 24

Results of one-way analysis of variance for statement number 20: The librarian has responsibility for developing and implementing procedures for acquisition of audio-visual materials.

CONDITION	MEANS		p
	Supt.	Libn.	
Actual	2.64706	2.95238	.1293
Ideal	3.37879	3.83439	.0009*

	Libn.	Prin.	
Actual	2.95238	2.65174	**
Ideal	3.83439	3.26650	.0000*

	Supt.	Prin.	
Actual	2.64706	2.65174	.9780
Ideal	3.37879	3.26650	.4408

* Significant at the .05 or greater level.
** Statistic not used. See note, page 12.

TABLE 25

Results of one-way analysis of variance for statement number 21: The librarian has responsibility for acquiring audio-visual equipment.

CONDITION	MEANS		p
	Supt.	Libn.	
Actual	2.11940	2.22713	.5416
Ideal	2.83582	3.32588	.0012*

	Libn.	Prin.	
Actual	2.22713	2.37065	.1371
Ideal	3.32588	2.98519	.0000*

	Supt.	Prin.	
Actual	2.11940	2.37065	.1265
Ideal	2.83582	2.98519	.3365

* Significant at the .05 or greater level.

There was no significant difference in the rankings superintendents and principals assigned to either actual or ideal conditions for any of the three acquisitions statements.

Storing and scheduling of equipment.--Significantly different rankings were assigned by the three groups in five of six comparisons on statement 22 (see table 26). This may indicate a difference in perception of the meaning of the statement, or it may be that certain large districts with a disproportionate number of principals and librarians have skewed the overall findings. In any event, the frequency distributions may be of interest and are provided in tables 27 and 28.

Comparison of the Complete Responsibility cell for librarians on tables 27 and 28 shows a rather unusual situation: fewer librarians assigned the highest ranking for the ideal condition than did so for the actual condition. Some who have complete responsibility now would apparently like to get rid of at least part of it. Nevertheless, the ideal condition seems to hold promise for the future; combining lines 4 and 5 for each group shows that 76.55 % of the librarians, 71.26 % of the principals, and 60.29 % of the superintendents would like to have librarians assume Much or Complete responsibility for storage and scheduling of equipment.

Developing policies and procedures for maintenance of equipment.--Rankings of superintendents and principals did not differ significantly, but the librarians' ranking of their ideal level of responsibility was significantly higher than the rankings of either principals or superintendents (see table 29).

Table 30 shows the frequency distribution for librarians' responsibility for developing policies and procedures for maintenance of audio-visual equipment. While the ideal means are above the Considerable Responsibility level,

TABLE 26

Results of one-way analysis of variance for statement number 22: The librarian has responsibility for the storage and scheduling of audio-visual equipment.

CONDITION	MEANS		p
	Supt.	Libn.	
Actual	2.86957	3.82132	.0000*
Ideal	3.64706	4.09464	.0047*

	Libn.	Prin.	
Actual	3.83132	3.39268	.0001*
Ideal	4.09464	3.84541	.0049*

	Supt.	Prin.	
Actual	2.86957	3.39268	.0068*
Ideal	3.64706	3.84541	.2006

* Significant at the .05 or greater level.

TABLE 27

Frequency distribution for statement number 22: The librarian has responsibility for the storage and scheduling of audio-visual equipment.

Actual Condition

RESPONSE CATEGORY	LIBRARIANS		PRINCIPALS		SUPERINTENDENTS	
	No.	o/o	No.	o/o	No.	o/o
No Response	4	*	4	*	2	*
0 Don't Know	1	*	4	*	1	*
1 Little or No Responsibility	52	16.30	80	19.51	18	26.09
2 Some Responsibility	24	7.52	37	9.02	13	18.84
3 Considerable Responsibility	18	5.64	55	13.41	11	15.94
4 Much Responsibility	60	18.81	118	28.78	14	20.29
5 Complete Responsibility	165	51.72	120	29.27	13	18.84

* Non-responses and zero (Don't Know) responses were not used in analysis or variance computations.

TABLE 28

Frequency distribution for statement number 22: The librarian has responsibility for the storage and scheduling of audio-visual equipment.

Ideal Condition

RESPONSE CATEGORY	LIBRARIANS		PRINCIPALS		SUPERINTENDENTS	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
No Response	5	*	3	*	4	*
0 Don't Know	2	*	1	*	0	*
1 Little or No Responsibility	19	5.86	34	8.21	3	4.41
2 Some Responsibility	21	6.48	19	4.59	10	14.71
3 Considerable Responsibility	29	8.95	66	15.94	14	20.59
4 Much Responsibility	90	27.78	153	36.96	22	32.35
5 Complete Responsibility	158	48.77	142	34.30	19	27.94

* Non-responses and zero (Don't Know) responses were not used in analysis or variance computations.

TABLE 29

Results of one-way analysis of variance for statement number 23: The librarian has responsibility for developing policies and procedures for maintenance of audio-visual equipment.

CONDITION	MEANS		p
	Supt.	Libn.	
Actual	2.33333	2.80635	**
Ideal	3.13235	3.55769	.0106*

	Libn.	Prin.	
Actual	2.80635	2.60000	.0684
Ideal	3.55769	3.21078	.0003*

	Supt.	Prin.	
Actual	2.33333	2.60000	.1414
Ideal	3.13235	3.21078	.6405

* Significant at the .05 or greater level.
** Statistic not used. See note, page 12.

TABLE 30

Frequency distribution for statement number 23: The librarian has responsibility for developing policies and procedures for maintenance of audio-visual equipment.

Ideal Condition

RESPONSE CATEGORY	LIBRARIANS		PRINCIPALS		SUPERINTENDENTS	
	No.	°/o	No.	°/o	No.	°/o
No Response	5	*	6	*	4	*
0 Don't Know	7	*	4	*	0	*
1 Little or No Responsibility	28	8.97	64	15.69	9	12.50
2 Some Responsibility	36	11.54	51	12.50	10	13.89
3 Considerable Responsibility	65	20.83	92	22.55	19	26.39
4 Much Responsibility	100	32.05	137	33.58	23	31.94
5 Complete Responsibility	83	26.60	64	15.69	7	9.72

* Non-responses and zero (Don't Know) responses were not used in analysis or variance computations.

it should be kept in mind that there is a fairly substantial minority in each group who sees the ideal condition as one where the librarian has Little or No Responsibility or, one step above that, Some Responsibility (see table 30, lines 1 and 2).

CHAPTER III

PERFORMANCE

This chapter provides data on role and function statements twenty-four through fifty-seven from the 418 principals and the 324 librarians who responded to the questionnaire. Response to these statements was not requested from superintendents, since the statements are concerned with performance; and campus level personnel, rather than superintendents or their assistants, were assumed to be better sources for this information

Performance Area I

This performance area, the first of three to be discussed in chapter three, was organized to include those role and function statements which involve periodicity, regularity, or consistency. The response categories are: 0 (zero) = Don't Know; 1 = Never, Not at all; 2 = Infrequently; 3 = Sometimes; 4 = Frequently; 5 = Always, Systematically.

Disseminating information on resources and services.--The means for the rankings from the analysis of variance findings, and particularly the means for the ideal conditions, clearly show that disseminating information to patrons on available resources is a service that is considered important (see table 31). Similarly, promoting the library's collections through displays and presentations (statement 25) and disseminating information on the effective use of materials and equipment (statement 26) are functions which are now performed at a 3 (Sometimes) level and would ideally be performed at a 4 plus (Frequently) level (see tables 32 and 33). Implementing these functions at a higher level would not seem to require significant additional funding, but rather a reordering of priorities on the part of librarians.

TABLE 31

Statement number 24. The librarian disseminates information to students and teachers on the availability of materials, equipment, and resources in the library.

	Libn.	Prin.	p
Actual	4.22500	3.88564	**
Ideal	4.75472	4.58252	**

TABLE 32

Statement number 25. The librarian promotes the library's collections and services by such means as displays, book talks, and classroom presentations.

	Libn.	Prin.	p
Actual	3.70405	3.75669	.5027
Ideal	4.48418	4.48301	.9807

TABLE 33

Statement number 26. The librarian disseminates information to students and teachers on effective use of materials and equipment.

	Libn.	Prin.	p
Actual	3.60313	3.46341	.0669
Ideal	4.37107	4.26764	.0509 *

Providing information on new teaching developments.--Supplying information to teachers on new teaching developments and practicies is now perceived by both librarians and principals as occurring at a 2 plus (Infrequently to Sometimes) level (see table 34). While both groups agree that increased activity would be desirable,

---

* Difference significant at the .05 or greater level.

** Statistic not used. See note, page 12.

the frequency distribution table for the ideal condition on this statement (not shown in this report) shows that 8.33% of all librarians and 7.18% of all principals rated this as a 1 (Never) activity at the ideal level. It is apparent from responses to this and some other statements (e.g. 13, 14, 29) that a persistent minority of both principals and librarians does not view the librarian as a full-fledged member of the instructional faculty.

Providing teachers with lists of materials useful in instruction (statement 28) is another function being performed at a Sometimes (3) level now but would be done Frequently (4) under ideal conditions (see table 35). Here, as in a number of other traditional library functions, the librarians ranked their actual activity significantly higher than the principals did.

TABLE 34

Statement number 27. The librarian provides information to teachers on new teaching developments and practices.

	Libn.	Prin.	p
Actual	2.55238	2.40100	.0747
Ideal	3.41196	3.36250	.5628

TABLE 35

Statement number 28. The librarian provides teachers with lists of materials useful in instruction.

	Libn.	Prin.	p
Actual	3.47188	3.27518	.0178*
Ideal	4.23885	4.15892	.1805

Participating on curriculum planning committees.--This is an especially

* Difference significant at the .05 or greater level.

important function and one that is not viewed in the same way by librarians and principals (see table 36). As shown in table 37, the significantly lower mean for librarians on the actual scale stems from the 136 librarians--44.44% of the total responding--who reported that they never participate on curriculum planning committees; whereas only 21.56% of the principals perceived librarian participation at the "Never" level. At the other end of the scale, a total of 15.68% of the librarians see their current involvement at the 4 (Frequently) and 5 (Always; Systematically) levels. Nearly twice that percentage--27.79%--of the principals ranked current librarian involvement on the two upper levels. It is somewhat bemusing to consider the Don't Know responses; one wonders why 24 principals would not know whether librarians participate on curriculum planning committees. It is even harder to understand why twelve librarians "did not know" whether they participated in curriculum planning, or why six librarians did not know what the ideal condition should be (see table 38).

The frequency distribution in table 38 shows that the ideal condition, as perceived by over 90% of the principals, would have librarians participating at the 3, 4, or 5 level. Even though the ideal ranking reported by librarians was significantly higher than that reported by principals, the way seems open for greater participation in curriculum planning by librarians.

TABLE 36

Statement number 29. The librarian participates on curriculum planning committees.

	Libn.	Prin.	p
Actual	2.07477	2.68571	.0000*
Ideal	4.04207	3.77444	.0004*

* Difference significant at the .05 or greater level.

TABLE 37

Frequency distribution for statement number 29: The librarian participates on curriculum planning committees.

Actual Condition

RESPONSE CATEGORY	LIBRARIANS		PRINCIPALS	
	No.		No.	
No Response	6	--	9	--
0 Don't Know	12	--	24	--
1 Never, Not at All	136	44.44	83	21.56
2 Infrequently	68	22.22	92	23.90
3 Sometimes	54	17.65	103	26.75
4 Frequently	33	10.78	77	20.00
5 Always, Systematically	15	4.90	30	7.79

TABLE 38

Frequency distribution for statement number 29: The librarian participates on curriculum planning committees.

Ideal Condition

RESPONSE CATEGORY	LIBRARIANS		PRINCIPALS	
	No.		No.	
No Response	9	--	10	--
0 Don't Know	6	--	9	--
1 Never, Not at All	7	2.27	12	3.01
2 Infrequently	15	4.85	26	6.52
3 Sometimes	55	17.80	100	25.06
4 Frequently	113	36.57	163	40.85
5 Always, Systematically	119	38.51	98	24.56

Designing information systems--Principals and librarians agree on their rankings for both actual and ideal conditions here (see table 39). Frequency distribution tables (not reproduced in this report) show that on the ideal condition, 5.26% of the principals and 10.49% of the librarians responded "Don't Know." In-service education is apparently needed for insuring librarian familiarity with, and competency in, this area.

Table 39

Statement number 30. The librarian designs information systems to meet the needs of students and teachers.

	Libn.	Prin.	p
Actual	3.01434	2.95526	.5426
Ideal	4.08273	3.94330	.0556

Traditional library functions.--Statements 31, 32, 33, and 34 are considered together, and the analysis of variance results are shown in tables 40, 41, 42, and 43. Examination of the mean scores shows that for every one of these statements, on both actual and ideal, the rankings by librarians are considerably higher than that assigned by principals. When one compares these findings with those for such management functions as planning and applying for funds (pp. 13 - 19), where principals assigned the higher rankings, a pattern seems to emerge. Librarians (put themselves on the line and) rank themselves highest in those traditional library functions where they feel secure and comfortable. They do not present themselves as strongly in the newer, less familiar areas. The validity of this pattern might be questionable since we are looking at two different areas (i.e. performance and responsibility) if there were not supporting evidence farther along in this performance section in the results from statements 35, 36, 38, and 39.

TABLE 40

Statement number 31. The librarian helps students choose appropriate materials to meet learning needs.

	Libn.	Prin.	p
Actual	4.34375	3.81863	**
Ideal	4.63522	4.35766	**

TABLE 41

Statement number 32. The librarian teaches students how to use materials available in the library.

	Libn.	Prin.	p
Actual	4.39498	4.16019	**
Ideal	4.78095	4.61165	**

TABLE 42

Statement number 33. The librarian applies learning theories to the evaluation of materials for inclusion in the collection.

	Libn.	Prin.	p
Actual	4.16452	3.48619	**
Ideal	4.56129	4.20408	**

TABLE 43

Statement number 34. The librarian evaluates materials for inclusion in the collection by utilizing suggestions from administrators and teachers.

	Libn.	Prin.	p
Actual	4.45938	3.96020	**
Ideal	4.63810	4.46324	.0002*

---

* Difference significant at the .05 or greater level.

** Statistic not used. See note page 12.

Using new production methods.--Principals ranked librarians' actual performance significantly higher than librarians ranked themselves (see table 44), but their perceptions of the ideal condition did not differ significantly. More than one-eighth (13.40%) of the principals responded "Don't Know" to the actual condition.

TABLE 44

Statement number 35. The librarian incorporates new production methods into the production of media.

	Libn.	Prin.	p
Actual	2.76014	2.98000	.0232*
Ideal	3.88591	3.96185	.3195

Using the systems approach.--There were no significant differences between rankings on this statement (see table 45). There were, however, 134 principals (32.06%) and 57 librarians (17.59%) who responded "Don't Know" on the actual condition.

The percentage of "Don't Know" responses was also quite high on the ideal condition--22.97% of the principals and 20.37% of the librarians. If the systems approach is valid in school learning resources centers (and we believe it is) a good deal of in-service education is needed. Furthermore, the current curriculum supporting school library certification needs major overhaul in most colleges and universities.

Gathering and using statistical and research data.--Statements 37 and 38 received very similar responses. The actual means are near the 3.0 (Sometimes level and are not significantly different for librarians and principals (see tables

* Difference significant at the .05 or greater level.

TABLE 45

Statement number 36. The librarian uses the systems approach to the study and design of library services.

	Libn.	Prin.	p
Actual	3.05021	3.20370	.1713
Ideal	4.00885	4.11960	.1569

46 and 47). The ideal levels are nearly at the 4.0 (Frequently) level for both groups and do not differ significantly.

TABLE 46

Statement number 37. The librarian gathers statistical data for use in managing the library.

	Libn.	Prin.	p
Actual	3.10423	3.04217	.5646
Ideal	3.95987	3.98352	.7467

TABLE 47

Statement number 38. The librarian applies basic research data reported in the literature to the management of the library.

	Libn.	Prin.	p
Actual	3.05941	3.11327	.5745
Ideal	3.91333	.399145	.2817

Planning and conducting research projects.--Librarians and principals agree that the current performance of librarians is weak and that ideally there would be much more research activity (see table 48). A lack of communication between principals and librarians is indicated by the large percentage (19.38%) of principals who responded "Don't Know" to the item on the actual condition and by the

11.72% of the principals who responded "Don't Know" to the ideal condition.

TABLE 48

Statement number 39. The librarian plans and conducts research projects to provide information for decision making.

	Libn.	Prin.	p
Actual	2.21333	2.23148	.8435
Ideal	3.42105	3.47045	.5467

Reading professional publications.--As was expected, both groups assigned high rankings to this activity on both the actual and the ideal scales (see table 49).

TABLE 49

Statement number 40. The librarian reads professional publications to keep abreast of developments in the field.

	Libn.	Prin.	p
Actual	4.42688	3.94901	**
Ideal	4.77044	4.48756	**

Performance Area II

This section considers six statements which ask respondents to indicate the extent to which the role or function is provided. The response scales have the following categories: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Makes No Provision; 2 = Makes Minimal Provision; 3 = Makes Partial Provision; 4 = Makes Substantial Provision; 5 = Makes Complete Provision.

As shown in table 50, five of the six statements were not found to have significantly different rankings between principals and librarians, although librarians

** Statistic not used. See note, page 12.

TABLE 50

Results of analysis of variance between principals and librarians for statements in performance area II.

Actual Condition

Role or Function Statements	Libn.	Prin.	p
41. The librarian makes provision for evaluation of the library's policies and procedures.	3.30097	3.27321	.7568
42. The librarian makes provision for reference services for the students and teachers in the school.	4.30408	3.86181	**
43. The librarian makes provision for resources which will support the school's curricular program.	4.14151	3.76485	**
44. The librarian makes provision for materials to meet the recreational needs of the students.	3.96508	3.40306	**
45. The librarian makes provision for professional materials to meet the needs of teachers and administrators.	3.31034	3.26303	.5591
46. The librarian makes provision for multicultural and multi-ethnic materials.	3.82019	3.64810	.0206*

Ideal Condition

Role or Function Statements	Libn.	Prin.	p
41. The librarian makes provision for evaluation of the library's policies and procedures.	4.26384	4.17776	.1096
42. The librarian makes provision for reference services for the students and teachers in the school.	4.60759	4.40547	**
43. The librarian makes provision for resources which will support the school's curricular program.	4.57188	4.35539	**
44. The librarian makes provision for materials to meet the recreational needs of the students.	4.36102	4.03731	**
45. The librarian makes provision for professional materials to meet the needs of teachers and administrators.	4.19745	4.14706	.3636
46. The librarian makes provision for multicultural and multi-ethnic materials.	4.30573	4.17037	.0151*

* Difference significant at the .05 or greater level.
** Statistic not used. See note, page 12.

consistently ranked these functions at higher levels than principals did. Four of these statements--providing reference services, providing resources in support of the curriculum, providing materials for the recreational needs of students, and providing professional materials for teachers--fit the traditional librarian activity category discussed earlier in connection with statements 31-34. The extent to which librarians are perceived as the primary source of these services was ascertained by examining the frequency distribution tables to determine the percentage of respondents who assigned ranks of 4 (Substantial Provision) and 5 (Complete Provision). Table 51 shows the combined total percentage for the two ranks of the actual condition. Frequency distribution totals for the two highest categories combined for the ideal condition for these statements follow in table 52.

The percentages shown in tables 51 and 52 warrant consideration even though the analysis of variances statistic has not been used.

The rather substantial percentage differences in perceptions of the actual condition for statements 42, 43, and 44 apparently denote a lack of common understanding as to who is doing what or, perhaps, of the rather standard terminology used in the statements. The gap which remains at the ideal level for statement 44, providing recreational material, might bear further investigation: where do the remaining 24% of the principals think students should get their recreational materials? The librarians' total of 46% on the actual scale for statement 45 reminds us that campus level professional libraries are generally inadequate.

TABLE 51

Percentage of principals and librarians who perceive the actual condition for statements 42-45 at the 4 & 5 levels.

Statement	of Librarians Ranking in 4 & 5 Combined	of Principals Ranking in 4 & 5 Combined
42. Providing reference services.	85.80	70.58
43. Providing resources to support the curriculum.	90.49	66.50
44. Providing materials to meet recreational needs.	77.16	51.67
45. Providing professional materials for teachers and administrators.	46.30	44.98

TABLE 52

Percentage of principals and librarians who perceive the ideal condition for statements 42-45 at the 4 & 5 levels.

Statement	of Librarians Ranking in 4 & 5 Combined	of Principals Ranking in 4 & 5 Combined
42. Providing reference services.	95.68	89.95
43. Providing resources to support the curriculum.	93.21	89.71
44. Providing materials to meet recreational needs.	86.42	76.32
45. Provoding professional materials for teachers and administrators.	84.26	84.45

Providing multi-cultural and multi-ethnic materials.--The librarians' rankings were significantly higher than those of principals for both the actual and the ideal conditions for this statement (see table 50). Since this service function has such

high priority in Texas, it would be well for librarians to be sure that their understanding of proper performance is congruent with that of the principals.

Performance Area III

This, the final section, covers eleven statements (47 through 57) which were considered by the investigators to be dichotomous in nature. The five interval scale was replaced in this section by response choices of 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Yes; and 5 = No. The computer was then programmed to treat the 1 (Yes) responses as 5's and the 5 (No) responses as 1's to maintain the 1 lowest to 5 highest ranking values of the previous 46 statements.

Since data summaries for seven of the eleven statements in this section require no comment, data on all eleven will be presented on the following pages in tables 53 and 54, with comments following the tables.

TABLE 53

Results of analysis of variance between principals and librarians for statements in performance area II.

Actual Condition

Role or Function Statements	Libn.	Prin.	p
47. The librarian formulates and is guided by specific objectives for the library.	4.78413	4.52304	**
48. The librarian provides adequate procedures for circulating print and audio-visual materials.	4.83333	4.42569	**
49. Print materials are organized according to the Dewey Decimal or other accepted classification system.	4.87382	4.91753	.3607
50. Audio-visual materials are organized according to the Dewey Decimal or other accepted classification system.	4.08280	4.08934	.9602
51. Access to print materials is provided through a card catalog and/or other records.	4.87500	4.88630	.8259
52. Access to audio-visual materials is provided through a card catalog and/or other records.	4.47003	4.22955	**
53. The librarian prepares an annual report on the progress and activities of the library.	3.26537	3.61157	.0217*
54. The librarian prepares an annual budget request.	3.65397	4.41085	**
55. The librarian maintains financial records to show campus level allocations and expenditures.	4.35443	4.28342	.5379
56. The librarian applies instructional design principles to the design of locally produced materials.	2.95781	3.55944	.0005*
57. The librarian provides adequate supervision of the library staff (including volunteers).	4.59609	4.68286	.3178

* Difference significant at the .05 or greater level.

** Statistic not used. See note, page 12.

TABLE 53--continued

Results of analysis of variance between principals and librarians for statements in performance area II.

Ideal Condition

Role or Function Statements	Libn.	Prin.	p
47. The librarian formulates and is guided by specific objectives for the library.	5.00000	4.94962	.0460*
48. The librarian provides adequate procedures for circulating print and audio-visual materials.	5.00000	4.95025	.0481*
49. Print materials are organized according to the Dewey Decimal or other accepted classification system.	4.96203	4.97995	.4758
50. Audio-visual materials are organized according to the Dewey Decimal or other accepted classification system.	4.80769	4.71123	.1898
51. Access to print materials is provided through a card catalog and/or other records.	4.97468	4.98000	.8131
52. Access to audio-visual materials is provided through a card catalog and/or other records.	4.96190	4.75635	**
53. The librarian prepares an annual report on the progress and activities of the library.	4.55700	4.74160	**
54. The librarian prepares an annual budget request.	4.76547	4.82957	.3316
55. The librarian maintains financial records to show campus level allocations and expenditures.	4.72816	4.70103	.7308
56. The librarian applies instructional design principles to the design of locally produced materials.	4.42358	4.70732	**
57. The librarian provides adequate supervision of the library staff (including volunteers).	4.97444	4.93939	.2730

* Difference significant at the .05 or greater level.

** Statistic not used. See note, page 12.

The uniformly high rankings by both librarians and principals on statements 47, 48, 49, 51, 52, 55, and 57 seem to indicate that these are standard expectations. Future versions of the survey instrument used in this study might mention them as presumed givens in a preliminary paragraph and omit them as response items.

Organizing and classifying audio-visual materials (statement 50).--Over one-fifth (22.22%) of the librarians reported that audio-visual materials are not organized according to the Dewey decimal or other accepted classification system. Principals confirmed this situation: 18.9% responded No and another 13.4% responded "Don't Know." The basic step, then, of providing bibliographic control of campus media collections must be accomplished in these schools before a workable learning resources center can be established. These percentages also suggest that far too many principals are not aware of what is happening in the library, since more than one out of eight principals does not know whether there is systematic bibliographic organization of audio-visual materials.

Preparing an annual report (statement 53).--The principals' lack of information, as evidenced by their responses to the previous statement, may be due in part to the lack of formal communication, since 41.36% of the librarians responded that they do not prepare an annual report on the progress and activities of the library. Principals once again had what seems to be an inordinate number of Don't Know responses--41 or 9.81 --along with 30.14% who responded that their librarians submitted no report.

Many librarians are currently failing to utilize the annual report as a means to communicate to their school and the community. Furthermore, some librarians and principals apparently do not recognize the value of such reports, such 10.49% of the librarians and 5.98% of the principals replied that even under ideal conditions they would not have an annual report made.

Preparing an annual budget request (statement 54).--The budget request is another potential communication device which is reported as unused by a substantial percentage--32.72%--of the librarians. Principals may have had a different understanding of what this function statement meant, since only 13.64% of them responded "No" to this item.

Applying instructional design principles to locally produced materials (statement 56).--The ability to utilize instructional design principles is one of the seven competency areas designated as required for entering level certification in the newly adopted Texas plan. The responses are therefore of considerable interest, and frequency distributions are shown in tables 54 and 55 as supplements to the analysis of variance data shown previously in table 53.

TABLE 54

Frequency distribution for statement number 56: The librarian applies instructional design principles to the design of locally produced materials.

Actual Condition

RESPONSE CATEGORY	LIBRARIANS		PRINCIPALS	
	No.		No.	
Blank	20	6.17	20	4.78
0 Don't Know	67	20.68	112	26.79
1 No	121	37.35	103	24.64
5 Yes	116	35.80	183	43.78

TABLE 55

Frequency distribution for statement number 56: The librarian applies instructional design principles to the design of locally produced materials.

Ideal Condition

RESPONSE CATEGORIES	LIBRARIANS		PRINCIPALS	
	No.		No.	
Blank	26	8.02	25	5.98
0 Don't Know	69	21.30	65	15.55
1 No	33	10.19	24	5.74
5 Yes	196	60.49	304	72.73

These tables show a considerable lack of understanding of the statement on the part of librarians and principals alike. More than 20 percent of the librarians and over 15 percent of the principals replied that they did not know whether librarians should apply instructional design principles under ideal conditions. Comparison of the percentages of "yes" answers on the actual and the ideal tables shows that a much higher level of performance would be called for in this area under ideal conditions. There are obvious implications here for those responsible for in-service and pre-service education of librarians. Furthermore, since principals are responsible for the campus level program, including the library, it seems reasonable to assume that some in-service for principals would also be in order.

We have seen numerous differences between the perceptions of librarians and administrators in chapters two and three, and have pointed out occasional instances where the Don't Know responses seemed noteworthy. The final section of this chapter is an organized presentation of those statements where the "Don't Knows" exceeded

ten percent of the total respondent group.

Don't Know Responses

The frequency distributions for the 57 statements show the percentages of respondents who replied Don't Know. Table 56 summarizes the Don't Know responses for the actual condition for those statements where the Don't Know response was equal to or greater than 10% of the responding principals; table 57 does the same for librarians. Both tables permit examination of responses from elementary and secondary school personnel separately. They show elementary librarians and principals as less knowledgeable than their secondary counterparts, and, as one might expect, there are more Don't Knows for principals than librarians. This is cause for concern if one believes that subordinate and superordinate relationships fare better in an atmosphere in which the roles and functions of each are known--to themselves and one another. In this time of transition from the library to the Learning Resources Center, it is not surprising that there is uncertainty among both librarians and principals as to the proper roles and functions of the librarian/Learning Resources Specialist. It would appear from the instances of principals' Don't Know responses reported for the actual condition, however, that librarians need to do more to communicate with their campus level administrators in a formal, systematic way to keep them abreast of library activities and concerns. In addition, it seems that pre-service and in-service education for administrators should include more information on the roles and functions of the librarian.

Administrative support for library activities is at least in part a function of administrators' knowledge of those activities. Perhaps secondary principals show a greater awareness of the librarians' roles and functions because 67.38% of the secondary librarians report that they prepare an annual report on their libraries'

TABLE 56

Don't Know responses from all secondary principals and from all elementary principals on significant statements relating to the actual condition where the percentage rate exceeded 10 percent

Statement no. and summary	Elem. Prin. (N = 276) Don't Know	Sec. Prin. (N = 142) Don't Know
3. Planning for the floor design furnishings, etc., for new facilities.	10.87	--
5. Preparing proposals for obtaining outside funds	14.13	--
8. Providing for use of materials through Interlibrary Loan, etc.	11.23	--
33. Applying learning theories to the evaluation of materials	11.96	--
35. Using new production methods	14.86	10.56
36. Using the systems approach	35.51	25.35
37. Gathering statistacal data	22.46	10.56
38. Applying basic research data to management	25.00	18.31
39. Planning and conducting research projects	22.10	14.08
40. Reading professional publications.	15.58	--
50. Organizing and classifying audio-visual materials	14.13	11.97
53. Preparing an annual report	10.51	--
56. Applying instructional design principles to locally produced materials.	27.54	25.35

TABLE 57

Don't Know responses from all secondary librarians and from all elementary librarians on significant statements relating to the actual condition where the percentage rate exceeded 10 percent

Statement no. and summary	Elem. Libn. (N = 178) Don't Know	Sec. Libn. (N = 144) Don't Know
2. Preparing the educational specifications for new facilities	13.48	--
3. Planning for the floor design furnishings, etc., for new facilities	14.04	11.11
4. Planning facilities for local design and production	11.80	--
5. Preparing proposals for obtaining outside funds	28.09	13.89
30. Designing information systems	11.80	--
36. Using the systems approach	17.42	18.06
56. Applying instructional design principles to locally produced materials	20.79	20.14

progress and activities, compared with only 46.99% of the elementary librarians. Regardless of the reasons which might be offered to explain the principals' Don't Knows, it is clear that corrective measures must be undertaken both by librarians and library educators to fill the existing information gaps. What support can librarians expect to receive from principals who Don't Know whether their librarian plans and conducts research projects? Such a situation represents a fundamental collapse in communications. Librarians must not make any assumptions concerning information that they might characterize as being self-evident and, therefore, known. They must communicate.

This concludes the discussion of the 57 statements. Chapter four considers the differences between subgroups of librarians.

CHAPTER IV

LIBRARIANS

Chapters II and III compared responses from all librarians with responses from principals and from superintendents. This chapter compares the responses of (1) all elementary librarians with those of all secondary librarians, (2) urban elementary librarians with those of urban secondary librarians, and (3) librarians in large school districts with those of librarians in small school districts.[1] Here we will consider only those questionnaire statements in which significant differences between sub-groups were found on either the actual or ideal response scales.

All Librarians: Elementary vs. Secondary

Statements where significant differences were found in the analysis of variance between responses from 178 elementary librarians and 144 secondary librarians have been grouped for convenience of discussion into (1) "Traditional" Librarian Activities, (2) Management Functions, and (3) Local Production of Materials Functions. A comparison of the mean rankings in these three areas is of interest because it shows a configuration which we have chosen to call a "descending familiarity/comfort response." Cognizance of the existence of this familiarity/comfort response, evidenced so generally by librarians, and of the areas where elementary and secondary librarians differ in this regard, seems to be basic in planning in-service training or continuing education activities.

Traditional Librarian Activities

With one exception, librarians' responses seemed to reflect a comfortable,

---

[1] A proposed comparison of responses from urban librarians with those from rural librarians could not be made because there were not enough responses from rural librarians.

secure, positive approach to those service and management activities which the investigators classed as traditional. High rankings were given to in-service education for the library staff (statement 10); developing and implementing acquisition procedures for print materials (statement 19); promoting the library's collection and services (statement 25); teaching students how to use materials (statement 32); and providing access to audio-visual materials through a card catalog or other records (statement 52). As shown in table 58, the actual and ideal means for the foregoing traditional activities have actual means ranging from a low of 3.44 to a high of 4.56 and ideal means ranging from a low of 4.00 to a high of 5.00.[1] Librarians, then, generally rank these responsibilities and performance areas at a high level both actually and ideally.

Developing listening, viewing, and responding skills (statement 13) was classed as a traditional activity; but the mean rankings, in contrast to those just discussed, were very low (see table 58). Conversations with superintendents and library supervisors indicate that statement 13 may not have been interpreted by the respondents in the way that was intended. The statement did not spell out that the librarian has responsibility for developing the listening, viewing... and reading and responding skills of students through the support work done for/with teachers as well as through direct instruction. A very narrow interpretation of the statement used could have contributed to the low means for statement 13, or it may be that this accurately reflects the condition in the field with whatever implications that may have for educators, supervisors, and the like.

A pattern which continues, as we shall see, throughout this comparison between elementary and secondary librarians emerges first here in the consideration of the

---

[1]Note that statement 13 is discussed separately and is not included in this analysis.

TABLE 58

Elementary librarians vs. secondary librarians

Results of analysis of variance on selected statements relating to "traditional" librarian activities

Role or Function Statements	Actual Condition **	Elem. Libns.	Sec. Libns.	p
10. The librarian has responsibility for providing in-service education for the library staff (including volunteers).	A	3.69697	4.06429	.0356*
13. The librarian has responsibility for developing the listening, viewing, and responding skills of students.	A	2.13295	1.71631	.0005*
19. The librarian has responsibility for developing and implementing procedures for acquisition (by purchase, exchange, or gift) of print materials.	A	3.44767	3.80142	.0270*
25. The librarian promotes the library's collections and services by such means as displays, book talks, and classroom presentations.	B	3.91429	3.45833	.0001*
32. The librarian teaches students how to use materials available in the library.	B	4.45402	4.32639	.1286
52. Access to audio-visual materials is provided through a card catalog and/or other records.	D	4.56322	4.34752	.1625

* Difference significant at the .05 or greater level.

** RESPONSE CATEGORIES:

A: 0-Don't know; 1=Has Little or No Responsibility; 2=Has Some Responsibility; 3=Has Considerable Responsibility; 4=Has Much Responsibility; 5=Has Complete Responsibility

B: 0=Don't Know; 1=Never; Not at All; 2=Infrequently; 3=Sometimes; 4=Frequently; 5=Always; Systematically

C: 0=Don't Know; 1=Makes No Provision; 2=Makes Minimal Provision; 3=Makes Partial Provision; 4=Makes Substantial Provision; 5=Makes Complete Provision

D: 0=Don't Know; 1=No; 5=Yes

TABLE 58, continued

Elementary librarians vs. secondary librarians

Results of analysis of variance on selected statements relating to "traditional" librarian activities

Role or Function Statement	Ideal Condition **	Elem. Libns.	Sec. Libns.	p
10. The librarian has responsibility for providing in-service education for the library staff (including volunteers).	A	4.22941	4.52174	.0356*
13. The librarian has responsibility for developing the listening, viewing, and responding skills of students.	A	2.67052	2.52555	.2301
19. The librarian has responsibility for developing and implementing procedures for acquisition (by purchase, exchange, or gift) of print materials.	A	4.00000	4.15108	.0284*
25. The librarian promotes the library's collections and services by such means as displays, book talks, and classroom presentations.	B	4.55491	4.39716	.0284*
32. The librarian teaches students how to use materials available in the library.	B	4.83237	4.71631	.0278*
52. Access to audio-visual materials is provided through a card catalog and/or other records.	D	5.00000	4.91304	.0502*

* Difference significant at the .05 or greater level.

** RESPONSE CATEGORIES:

A: 0=Don't Know; 1=Has Little or No Responsibility; 2=Has Some Responsibility; 3=Has Considerable Responsibility; 4=Has Much Responsibility; 5=Has Complete Responsibility

B: 0=Don't Know; 1=Never; Not at All; 2=Infrequently; 3=Sometimes; 4=Frequently; 5=Always; Systematically

C: 0=Don't Know; 1=Makes No Provision; 2=Makes Minimal Provision; 3=Makes Partial Provision; 4=Makes Substantial Provision; 5=Makes Complete Provision

D: 0=Don't Know; 1=No; 5=Yes

traditional activities. Note that on the actual condition for the four statements which differed significantly, elementary librarians perceive their responsibility or performance on statement 13, developing listening, viewing, and responding skills, and statement 25, promoting the libraries collections and services--both service-related functions--at a significantly higher level than do secondary librarians.

Conversely, secondary librarians ranked themselves significantly higher on management-related functions--statement 10, providing in-service education for library staff, and statement 19, developing and implementing acquisition procedures for print materials.

They differed again on the ideal conditions for statement 32, teaching students how to use library materials, and statement 52, providing access to audio-visual materials, both service-related functions. Elementary librarians assigned significantly higher performance level rankings in both cases.

Elementary librarians assigned significantly higher ranks to a management-related function only on statement 18, making adequate provision for previewing materials, to be discussed in the next section.

Librarians disagree significantly on both the actual and the ideal rankings for the function of promoting the library's collection and services, and in both cases elementary librarians rank this statement at a higher level than do secondary librarians. Of the elementary librarians, 70.28% placed their actual performance at the Frequently-to-Always level; whereas only 47.92% of the secondary librarians say they perform at this level. At the ideal, their respective percentages at the 5 (Always, Systematically) level were 95.37% and 91.49%.[1]

Promotion of the library's collection and services is a direct form of outreach to all users of the library. Both elementary and secondary librarians

---

[1]See note, page 29.

should be able to involve student assistants in the planning and development of displays and other promotional activities, thereby giving students creative outlets and educational experiences, as well as promoting the library on a systematic basis. It would appear, in short, that librarians, through planning and use of available resources, could approach their ideal on this statement.

The actual performance reported by secondary librarians suggests that they do not place a very high priority on promotion (perhaps displays are seen as "kid stuff"?), but their ideal would tend to belie this view. The commitment to an outreach philosophy is reflected generally in librarianship and should be a fundamental component of (and a stated underlying assumption in) both pre-service and in-service education for librarianship.

On statement 32, librarians agree that their actual performance in teaching students to use available materials is at the Frequently-to-Always level, but their perceptions of the ideal condition differ significantly. Of elementary librarians, 84.97% place the ideal at the Always/Systematically level, compared with 73.76% of the secondary librarians. Perhaps secondary librarians see their students as being more capable of independent performance in the use of library materials without instruction. Nevertheless, the ideal means are at a high level (4.83--4.71) for both groups, and such teaching is evidently seen as a high priority activity, particularly where librarians are striving to reach their ideal levels.

One would think that, regardless of the actual condition reported for statement 52, providing access to audio-visual materials, all librarians would be in agreement as to what the ideal condition should be. We find, however, that there is statistically significant disagreement on the ideal. Every one of the elementary librarians sees the ideal at Yes, compared with 97.83% of the secondary librarians. The frequency distributions for both the actual and ideal levels show that several

respondents reported that they Don't Know. Leaving aside speculations as to what situations might prevail which would leave a librarian in a state of ignorance about whether he/she provides access, we are still left with a few secondary librarians who think that ideally there should be no access to audio-visual materials "through a card catalog and/or other records." We are unable to explain such responses. At any rate, the distribution for the actual condition shows that 42 respondents report they do not currently provide such access and suggests that in-service education is needed for bibliographic control of audio-visual materials.

Management Functions

Many librarians assume the role of manager with less assurance than they assume the traditional roles and functions discussed in the previous section. As we shall see, this discomfort is evidenced in low rankings for important functions. A statistical summary for the management function statements to be discussed in this section is given in table 59.

Of the significant management functions, secondary librarians ranked their responsibility levels and performance levels significantly higher than did elementary librarians in four of the five statements. Secondary librarians report a significantly greater level of responsibility for coordinating deliveries and returns of materials from the regional service center (statement 7) than do elementary librarians; but neither group ranks it particularly high, either actually or ideally. Of the elementary librarians, 48.10% indicate that they actually have Little or No Responsibility, as do 41.48% of the secondary librarians. One of the interviewed superintendents suggested that the low rankings for this activity might be a result of faulty wording of the statement. Since schools order other materials from the regional service centers in addition to classroom related materials, the superintendent thought that a specification of the "materials"

TABLE 59

Elementary librarians vs. secondary librarians

Results of analysis of variance on selected statements relating to management functions

Actual Condition

Role or function statements	**	Elem. Libns.	Sec. Libns.	p
7. The librarian has responsibility for co-ordinating deliveries and returns of materials from the regional service center.	A	2.32911	2.84444	.0092*
18. The librarian has responsibility for making adequate provision for previewing materials being considered for the collection.	A	3.06395	2.60563	.0056*
37. The librarian gathers statistical data for use in managing the library.	B	2.81928	3.41727	.0002*
38. The librarian applies basic research data reported in the literature to the management of the library.	B	2.93976	3.20741	.0521*
53. The librarian prepares an annual report on the progress and activities of the library.	D	2.87952	3.69504	.0003*

* Difference significant at the .05 or greater level.

** RESPONSE CATEGORIES:

A: 0=Don't Know; 1=Has Little or No Responsibility; 2=Has Some Responsibility; 3=Has Considerable Responsibility; 4=Has Much Responsibility; 5=Has Complete Responsibility

B: 0=Don't Know; 1=Never; Not at All; 2=Infrequently; 3=Sometimes; 4=Frequently 5=Always; Systematically

C: 0=Don't Know; 1=Makes No Provision; 2=Makes Minimal Provision; 3=Makes Partial Provision; 4=Makes Substantial Provision; 5=Makes Complete Provision

D: 0=Don't Know; 1=No; 5=Yes

TABLE 59, continued

Elementary librarians vs. secondary librarians

Results of analysis of variance on selected statements relating to management functions

Ideal Condition

Role or function statements	**	Elem. Libns.	Sec. Libns.	p
7. The librarian has responsibility for co-ordinating deliveries and returns of materials from the regional service center.	A	2.95570	3.28676	.0647
18. The librarian has responsibility for making adequate provision for previewing materials being considered for the collection.	A	3.78035	3.73571	.6920
37. The librarian gathers statistical data for use in managing the library.	B	3.76687	4.17910	*
38. The librarian applies basic research data reported in the literature to the management of the library.	B	3.82036	4.02290	.0648
53. The librarian prepares an annual report on the progress and activities of the library.	D	4.40120	4.73913	*

* Statistic not used. See note, p. 12.

** RESPONSE CATEGORIES:

A: 0=Don't Know; 1=Has Little or No Responsibility; 2=Has Some Responsibility; 3=Has Considerable Responsibility; 4=Has Much Responsibility; 5=Has Complete Responsibility

B: 0=Don't Know; 1=Never; Not at All; 2=Infrequently; 3=Sometimes; 4=Frequently 5=Always; Systematically

C: 0=Don't Know; 1=Makes No Provision; 2=Makes Minimal Provision; 3=Makes Partial Provision; 4=Makes Substantial Provision; 5=Makes Complete Provision

D: 0=Don't Know; 1=No; 5=Yes

in statement 7 would have elicited a more accurate response. Another explanation for the low rankings is the rather common practice of assigning one librarian to several campuses, and, as a result, making them unlikely candidates for building coordinators. Even so, it is difficult not to question such a high percentage in the Little or No Responsibility rank since the responsibilities of the Building Media Coordinator, as outlined in the Catalog of the Materials Resources Center, Education Service Center, Region XI, would appear to be "naturals" for the campus-level librarian:

> 1. Each Building Media Coordinator needs to have a thorough knowledge of the Media Services offered by the Education Service Center, Region XI, and should keep the faculty and administration of his/her building informed of these services.
>
> 2. The Building Media Coordinator must know the procedures for obtaining "Loan Materials" and other services from the media component of the Education Service Center. It is his duty to keep the professional staff of his school informed of the services available and help them to secure these services.
>
> 3. The Building Media Coordinator should accept some responsibility in providing opportunities for the professional growth of the teachers in his school. This may be accomplished by arranging for in-service education workshops in Media. These workshops will be provided, upon request, by the Education Service Center and all supplies are furnished by the Media Division.

Secondary librarians report their actual performance at significantly higher levels on management statement 37, gathering statistical data for use in managing the library; statement 38, applying research reported in the literature to management of the library, and statement 53, preparing an annual report on progress and activities of the library.

Elementary librarians ranked themselves significantly higher on only one of these five management-related statements: providing for previewing materials being considered for the collection (statement 18). A total of 50% of the elementary librarians placed their actual responsibility at the Much and Complete levels, compared with only 33.10% of the secondary librarians who assigned those levels.

Perhaps teaching faculty in the secondary schools assume a larger share of this responsibility than they do in the elementary school.

Except for statement 18 where responses from elementary librarians produced higher actual and ideal means, secondary librarians gave each of the management functions higher rankings. Secondary librarians seem to place higher priority on management functions--traditional or otherwise. Secondary librarians' actual means are higher for statements 7, 10, 19, 37, 38, and 53--all management-related statements. Conversely, elementary librarians give higher means (and therefore higher priority?) to direct service-related statements: numbers 11, 13, 25, 32, 35, 52, and 56.

Do secondary libraries require more management than elementary libraries? Do secondary library patrons demand less service than elementary library patrons? Do elementary librarians as a group prefer the service aspects of their positions and do secondary librarians prefer the management aspects? Do elementary librarians perceive themselves more as teachers and do secondary librarians view themselves more as administrators? Is there, in fact, a fundamental difference between being the librarian in an elementary school and being the librarian in a secondary school? These questions have not been resolved by the current research but seem to be likely areas for further study.

Regardless of which group has the higher mean score on a given management-related statement, the scores, as a group, are relatively lower than those reported earlier for the traditional activities. Pre-service and in-service education should include information in support of statement 37, data gathering, so that librarians will know what data are to be gathered, how to gather data, and how the data can be used to provide information for management decisions and/or to provide justification for requests to school administrators.

Perhaps more important is the preparation of an annual report on the library's progress and activities (statement 53). Even though 67.38% of the secondary librarians (but only 46.99% of the elementary librarians) said they prepared such a report, principals evidenced a sometimes dismaying lack of knowledge concerning their libraries and their librarians' roles and functions (see page 72). An annual report either to an administrator or to a library supervisor can be a valuable tool for establishing priorities, for focusing short and long-range plans, for evaluating services and programs, for monitoring the operation and giving the librarian an overview of the program, and for communicating formally the library's activities to school administrators and the community. The merits of preparing such a report, along with preparation guidelines, should be presented in pre-service and in-service education.

Local Production of Materials Functions

Local production of materials is a responsibility/performance activity which accrues to librarians when they become Learning Resources Specialists and their libraries become Learning Resources Centers. Since this change in concept, practice, and indeed, in Certification Requirements, is still in progress, it is not surprising that there is a tendency toward low rankings for both actual and ideal conditions in this area. Table 60 provides a statistical summary for these statements. As in other areas of the study, the gap between the actual means and the ideal means shown in table 60 has clear implications for pre-service and in-service education.

Local production functions statements represent the lowest category of the descending familiarity/comfort response. Statement 11, producing materials, is the basic component of this group, since statements 35, using new production methods, and

TABLE 60

Elementary librarians vs. secondary librarians

Results of analysis of variance on selected statements relating to local production

Actual Condition

Role or Function Statement	**	Elem. Libns.	Sec. Libns.	p
11. The librarian has responsibility for campus level production of materials that aid teachers in the classroom.	A	2.08140	1.81295	.0464*
35. The librarian incorporates new production methods into the production of media.	B	3.00625	2.46269	.0003*
56. The librarian applies instructional design principles to the design of locally produced materials.	D	3.29008	2.52381	.0033*

Ideal Condition

Role or Function Statement	**	Elem. Libns.	Sec. Libns.	p
11. The librarian has responsibility for campus level production of materials that aid teachers in the classroom.	A	2.87356	2.68613	.1636
35. The librarian incorporates new production methods into the production of media.	B	3.95758	3.78626	.1760
56. The librarian applies instructional design principles to the design of locally produced materials.	D	4.48092	4.33333	.4382

* Difference significant at the .05 or greater level.

** RESPONSE CATEGORIES:

A: 0=Don't Know; 1=Has Little or No Responsibility; 2=Has Some Responsibility; 3=Has Considerable Responsibility; 4=Has Much Responsibility; 5=Has Complete Responsibility

B: 0=Don't Know; 1=Never; Not at All; 2=Infrequently; 3=Sometimes; 4=Frequently; 5=Always; Systematically

D: 0=Don't Know; 1=No; 5=Yes

56, applying instructional design principles to locally produced materials, presuppose statement 11. Statement 11 has the lowest actual and ideal means of all the significant statements (except of course the troublesome statement 13). That statement 11 is ranked so low actually is not surprising, since it is a new area of librarian responsibility. That it is ranked so low ideally is perhaps a reflection of librarians' lack of training and familiarity in this area and of a hesitancy to assume yet another role.

Elementary librarians ranked their actual responsibility and performance levels significantly higher on each of the local production statements (all service-related functions) than did secondary librarians. As has been noted, however, the means as a group are quite low compared with the means for statements in the area of traditional activities. A review of the frequency distribution for the actual condition will help account for these low means. For the basic statement 11, producing materials, 41.86% of the elementary librarians and 55.40% of the secondary librarians reported their current responsibility at the 1 (Little or No) level. The frequency of using new production methods, statement 35, was ranked at either Never (1) or Infrequently (2) by 30% of the elementary librarians and 55.22% of the secondary librarians. As for applying instructional design principles to locally produced materials, statement 56, 42.75% of the elementary librarians and 69.90% of the secondary librarians replied No.[1] Since incorporating new production methods and applying instructional design principles would seem to be contingent primarily on whether the incorporator is knowledgeable about, and skilled in, those new methods and principles, in-service education would be appropriate here to help librarians reach their ideals and to achieve the competencies specified in the certification requirements.

Responses to the actual condition in statement 56 provide considerable evidence of librarians' lack of information in this area of their profession: 20.79% of the

---

[1] See note, page 29.

elementary librarians and 20.14% of the secondary librarians replied Don't Know.

Urban Librarians: Elementary vs. Secondary

The population of all librarians discussed in the previous section consists primarily of librarians from counties which are designated as urban. Therefore, the comparison between urban elementary and secondary librarians yielded substantially the same significant statements as did the comparison between all elementary and secondary librarians. Two statements which did not differ significantly in the previous comparison will be discussed in this section, and data summaries are presented in table 61.

Urban secondary librarians perceive themselves as having significantly more actual responsibility for both statement 2, preparing educational specifications for new facilities, and statement 3, planning for the floor design, furnishings, etc., than do urban elementary librarians; but both groups place their level of responsibility at a low rank. One of the superintendents who was interviewed suggested that most respondents would, of necessity, have answered these statements from a hypothetical rather than an experiential perspective. Perhaps these means give us a picture, then, of how librarians think their administrators would involve them in the process; that is, if the situation described in statement 2 or 3 presented itself, librarians believe they would be allowed to give only Some-plus input. Such an interpretation would suggest that many librarians do not see themselves as having much actual influence with their administrators or much actual control over their working environment.

As was discussed in chapter II, both superintendents and principals ranked librarians' actual responsibility for planning at a higher level than the librarians did. It would seem, then, that librarians could assume more responsibility than they currently think.

TABLE 61

Urban elementary librarian vs. urban secondary librarian

Results of analysis of variance on selected statements

Actual Condition

Role or function statement	***	Elem. Libns.	Sec. Libns.	p
2. When new or remodeled library facilities are needed, the librarian has responsibility for preparing the educational specifications for them.	A	2.03974	2.33613	.0444*
3. When new or remodeled library facilities are planned, the librarian has responsibility for planning for the floor design, furnishings, etc.	A	1.94667	2.23276	.0505*

Ideal Condition

Role or function statement	***	Elem. Libns.	Sec. Libns.	p
2. When new or remodeled library facilities are needed, the librarian has responsibility for preparing the educational specifications for them.	A	3.72571	3.85039	.1352
3. When new or remodeled library facilities are planned, the librarian has responsibility for planning for the floor design, furnishings, etc.	A	3.68571	3.88281	**

* Difference significant at the .05 or greater level.

** Statistic not used. See note, p. 12.

*** Response category A: 0=Don't Know; 1=Has Little or No Responsibility; 2=Has Some Responsibility; 3=Has Considerable Responsibility; 4=Has Much Responsibility; 5=Has Complete Responsibility

In concluding this section, we note that statements 2 and 3 are both management-related responsibilities to which secondary librarians assigned significantly higher actual means in keeping with the pattern observed earlier.

All Librarians: Large Districts vs. Small Districts

For purposes of this study, large districts are defined as those having ten or more campuses and small districts as those having nine or fewer campuses. The study includes 8 large districts with school library supervisors, and 232 of the 251 returns from librarians in large districts came from those eight districts. The large districts are primarily urban and suburban. As was noted previously, there are elementary librarians in some large districts who serve several campuses. The small districts are suburban as well as rural, and no responding small district has a school library supervisor. In several small districts, however, one librarian serves all the district's schools with the assistance of aides or volunteers. The responding campus librarian from a large district is therefore likely to have administrative/management back-up from the library supervisor for that district; and the library supervisor shares to some extent the responsibility for, and the performance of, such management functions as statement 16, formulating and recommending for adoption selection policies for print materials. Conversely, a responding campus librarian from a small district may well be the librarian for that district; and management functions may be a crucial and time-demanding part of his/her role, leaving more service-related functions to the aides and/or volunteers who staff the various campus libraries and handle day-to-day operations. Against this background, then, we will consider the statements which showed significant differences in the perceptions of these two groups of librarians.

Table 62 presents the data summary for those statements which were significant

TABLE 62

Librarians: large districts vs. small districts

Results of analysis of variance
Responsibility area***

Actual Condition

Role or function statements	Large	Small	p
8. The librarian has responsibility for providing for use of materials from outside the school by activities such as Interlibrary Loan and maintaining a community resources file.	2.59641	2.18841	.0509*
9. The librarian has responsibility for designing and conducting in-service training programs for teachers.	1.72428	1.38028	.0106*
10. The librarian has responsibility for providing in-service education for the library staff (including volunteers).	3.85232	3.91429	.7651
16. The librarian has responsibility for formulating and recommending for adoption policies for the evaluation and selection of library books, periodicals, and other print materials for the collection.	3.84400	4.23288	.0160*
19. The librarian has responsibility for developing and implementing procedures for acquisition (by purchase, exchange, or gift) of print materials.	3.43621	4.19444	**

* Difference significant at the .05 or greater level.

** Statistic not used. See note, p. 12.

*** Response category A: 0=Don't Know; 1=Has Little or No Responsibility; 2=Has Some Responsibility; 3=Has Considerable Responsibility; 4=Has Much Responsibility; 5=Has Complete Responsibility

TABLE 62, continued

Librarians: large districts vs. small districts

Results of analysis of variance
Responsibility area***

Ideal Condition

Role or function statements	Large	Small	p
8. The librarian has responsibility for providing for use of materials from outside the school by activities such as Interlibrary Loan and maintaining a community resources file.	3.45022	3.22857	.4871
9. The librarian has responsibility for designing and conducting in-service training programs for teachers.	2.65574	2.31884	.0249*
10. The librarian has responsibility for providing in-service education for the library staff (including volunteers).	4.30000	4.57143	.0457*
16. The librarian has responsibility for formulating and recommending for adoption policies for the evaluation and selection of library books, periodicals, and other print materials for the collection.	4.18145	4.65575	.0042*
19. The librarian has responsibility for developing and implementing procedures for acquisition (by purchase, exchange, or gift) of print materials.	3.99184	4.33333	.0041*

* Difference significant at the .05 or greater level.

** Statistic not used. See note, p. 12.

*** Response category A: 0=Don't Know; 1=Has Little or No Responsibility; 2=Has Some Responsibility; 3=Has Considerable Responsibility; 4=Has Much Responsibility 5=Has Complete Responsibility

in the Responsibility Area. Response categories are scaled as follows: 0=Don't Know; 1=Little or No Responsibility; 2=Some Responsibility; 3=Considerable Responsibility; 4=Much Responsibility; 5=Complete Responsibility.

Of the five statements, three were significant on the actual condition. Large district librarians reported their responsibility at a significantly higher level for the two service-related functions: statement 8, providing for Interlibrary Loan, and statement 9, designing and conducting in-service training programs for teachers. Small district librarians reported a significantly higher responsibility level for the management-related statement 16, formulating and recommending for adoption selection policies for print materials.

The same pattern emerges for the ideal condition, where four of the statements showed significant differences. Again, the large district librarians are significantly higher in their perceptions of the ideal responsibility level for statement 9, a service-related responsibility. On the other hand, librarians in small districts ranked the ideal responsibility levels higher for management-related functions as represented by statement 10, providing in-service education for library staff; statement 16; and statement 19, developing and implementing procedures for acquisition of print materials. These means tend to suggest that the librarian in the small district is forced by the realities of the situation to place a higher priority on management-related activities than on service-related functions.

The comparatively low actual and ideal means for statement 8, providing for Interlibrary Loan, and statement 9, designing and conducting in-service training programs for teachers, indicate a need for pre-service and in-service training for librarians. One would think that the responsibility for providing Interlibrary Loan service would belong completely to the librarian, and the librarian would be the logical person to provide centralized coordination of access to community re-

sources, even though counselors and teachers may also maintain files pertinent to their activities. The very low means for statement 9 (Little or No-plus for the actual level of responsibility) suggest that librarians do not perceive themselves as coequal with the rest of faculty. At any rate, there are implications here for pre-service and in-service training, since workshops with teachers can provide good opportunities for building faculty-library relationships and for promoting the library's services and collection.

Performance Areas I, II, and III

Significant differences were found in eleven Performance Area statements, and table 63 presents the data summary.

Librarians from large and small districts disagreed significantly on the actual condition for every one of these eleven statements. The only statement which received a higher mean from small district librarians is statement 41, providing for evaluation of the libraries policies and procedures--a management function. All of the other statements are service-related and received higher means from librarians in large districts, except for the management-related statement 54, preparing an annual budget request. Here the pattern was broken, since large district librarians ranked it higher than small district librarians did. We may speculate that more librarians from large districts prepare annual budget requests because their library supervisors force them to do so or that superintendents handle fiscal matters themselves in small districts. Be that as it may, it is very useful in a pre-service education program to be able to tell a prospective learning resources specialist about the variations in role and function expectations which he/she might expect in a small district as contrasted with a large district.

TABLE 63

Librarians: large districts vs. small districts

Results of analysis of variance
Performance areas I, II, & III

Actual Condition

Role or function statements	**	Large	Small	p
24. The librarian disseminates information to students and teachers on the availability of materials, equipment, and resources in the library.	B	4.27935	4.04110	.0129*
25. The librarian promotes the library's collections and services by such means as displays, book talks, and classroom presentations.	B	3.77823	3.45205	.0151*
26. The librarian disseminates information to students and teachers on effective use of materials and equipment.	B	3.72470	3.19178	.0001*
27. The librarian provides information to teachers on new teaching developments and practices.	B	2.63786	2.26389	.0170*
30. The librarian designs information systems to meet the needs of students and teachers.	B	3.11628	2.67188	.0224*
31. The librarian helps students choose appropriate materials to meet learning needs.	B	4.38886	4.19178	.0173*
41. The librarian makes provision for evaluation of the library's policies and procedures.	C	3.23109	3.53521	.0463*
46. The librarian makes provision for multicultural and multi-ethnic materials.	C	3.91020	3.51389	.0018*
51. Access to print materials is provided through a card catalog and/or other records.	D	4.98387	4.50000	.0077*
54. The librarian prepares an annual budget request.	D	3.79835	3.16667	.0127*
56. The librarian applies instructional design principles to the design of locally produced materials.	D	3.14208	2.33333	.0089*

* Difference significant at the .05 or greater level.

** RESPONSE CATEGORIES:

B: 0=Don't Know; 1=Never, Not at All; 2=Infrequently; 3=Sometimes; 4=Frequently; 5=Always; Systematically

C: 0=Don't Know; 1=Makes No Provision; 2=Makes Minimal Provision; 3=Makes Partial Provision; 4=Makes Substantial Provision; 5=Makes Complete Provision

D: 0=Don't Know; 1=No; 5=Yes

TABLE 63, continued

Librarians: large districts vs. small districts

Results of analysis of variance
Performance areas I, II, & III

Ideal Condition

Role or function statements	***	Large	Small	p
24. The librarian disseminates information to students and teachers on the availability of materials, equipment and resources in the library.	B	4.76327	4.72603	.5556
25. The librarian promotes the library's collections and services by such means as displays, book talks, and classroom presentations.	B	4.48148	4.49315	.8907
26. The librarian disseminates information to students and teachers on effective use of materials and equipment.	B	4.43673	4.15068	.0026*
27. The librarian provides information to teachers on new teaching developments and practices.	B	3.49138	3.14493	.0274*
30. The librarian designs information systems to meet the needs of students and teachers.	B	4.11574	3.96774	.2572
31. The librarian helps students choose appropriate materials to meet learning needs.	B	4.64898	4.58904	.3767
41. The librarian makes provision for evaluation of the library's policies and procedures.	C	4.21008	4.4[illegible]28	**
46. The librarian makes provision for multi-cultural and multi-ethnic materials.	C	4.33058	4.22222	.2575
51. Access to print materials is provided through a card catalog and/or other records.	D	5.00000	4.88571	.0077*
54. The librarian prepares an annual budget request.	D	4.76667	4.76119	.9665
56. The librarian applies instructional design principles to the design of locally produced materials.	D	4.52542	4.07692	**

* Difference significant at the .05 or greater level.
** Statistic not used. See note, page 12.
*** RESPONSE CATEGORIES:
B: 0=Don't Know; 1=Never, Not at All; 2=Infrequently; 3=Sometimes; 4=Frequently; 5=Always; Systematically
C: 0=Don't Know; 1=Makes no Provision; 2=Makes Minimal Provision; 3=Makes Partial Provision; 4=Makes Substantial Provision; 5=Makes Complete Provision
D: 0=Don't Know; 1=No; 2=Yes

The frequency of Don't Know responses (21.12% of the large district librarians and 19.18% of the small district librarians) for the actual condition on statement 56, applying instructional design principles to the design of locally produced materials, suggests a need for in-service and pre-service training in this area. A comment from an urban librarian written in the margin of the ideal scale of this statement may be representative of the way some librarians are feeling about the new responsibilities proposed for them. He/she wrote, after checking the "Don't Know" column, "[I] Don't care to know."

In summary, then, it appears that the presence or absence of library supervisors and the number of libraries assigned to a given librarian influence the situation of the campus librarian in regard to service vs. management functions. While campus-level librarians in large districts may have in-put into policy formulation and procedure development, they apparently do not have primary responsibility in these areas and therefore devote more time to day-to-day operations. The small district librarian, on the other hand, may spend large blocks of time in in-service training for the aides and volunteers on whom she/he depends so heavily and in designing policies and procedures to serve as guidelines for the day-to-day activity of aides. These observations do not, however, provide any insight into reasons that would explain why librarians in small districts have lower ideal rankings on library service statements than do librarians in large districts. Perhaps it is a matter of lowered sights, given the realities (money, staffing, size of collection) of their situation.

CHAPTER V

PRINCIPALS

This chapter examines those statements in which ANOVA showed a significant difference in the responses from all elementary principals and those from all secondary principals, the responses from all urban elementary principals and those from all urban secondary principals, the responses from all principals in large school districts and those from all principals in small school districts, and the responses from all urban principals and those from all rural principals.

For the sake of the discussion, each of the following sections will be divided into two groups: statements from the Responsibility Area of the survey instrument and statements from the Performance Areas.

All Principals: Elementary vs. Secondary

Responsibility Area

The comparison between the 276 elementary principals and the 142 secondary principals yielded twelve statements from the Responsibility Area of the survey instrument in which a significant difference between the two groups was found. Response categories in the Responsibility Area were scaled as follows: 0 (zero) = Don't Know; 1 = Has Little or No Responsibility; 2 = Has Some Responsibility; 3 = Has Considerable Responsibility; 4 = Has Much Responsibility; 5 = Has Complete Responsibility. Table 64 presents a data summary for these twelve statements and serves as background for the following discussion.

Perhaps the most striking relationship disclosed by the comparison between elementary and secondary principals (both here and in the Performance Areas to be discussed below) is the fact that on each and every significant statement secondary

TABLE 64

Elementary principals vs. secondary principals

Results of analysis of variance on selected statements in the responsibility area**

Actual Condition

Role or function statements	Means		
	Elem. prin.	Sec. prin.	p
1. Formulating long range plans	2.99254	3.20567	.0554
2. Preparing the educational specifications for new facilities	2.26295	2.65942	.0018*
3. Planning for the floor design; furnishings, etc., for new facilities	2.09544	2.58394	.0002*
5. Preparing proposals for obtaining outside funds	1.95633	2.32000	.0117*
6. Coordinating deliveries and returns of materials from the school district's center	3.34463	3.54167	.3009
7. Coordinating deliveries and returns of materials from the regional service center	2.45714	2.94308	.0087*
8. Providing for use of materials through Interlibrary Loan, etc.	2.19492	2.77778	.0002*
10. Providing in-service education for staff	3.42857	3.93431	.0006*
16. Formulating policies for selecting print materials	3.35556	3.80986	.0002*
18. Providing for previewing materials	2.81919	3.07746	.0512*
19. Developing acquisition procedures for print materials	2.69650	3.32609	.0000*
20. Developing acquisition procedures for audio-visual materials	2.56322	2.81560	.0619

* Difference significant at the .05 or greater level.

** Response category A: 0=Don't Know; 1=Little or No Responsibility; 2=Has Some Responsibility; 3=Has Considerable Responsibility; 4=Has Much Responsibility; 5=Has Complete Responsibility

TABLE 64, continued

Elementary principals vs. secondary principals

Results of analysis of variance on selected statements in the responsibility area***

Ideal Condition

Role or function statements	Means		
	Elem. prin.	Sec. Prin.	p
1. Formulating long range plans	3.60517	3.78571	.0296*
2. Preparing the educational specifications for new facilities	3.38577	3.56738	.0389*
3. Planning for the floor design; furnishings, etc., for new facilities	3.28839	3.56738	.0021*
5. Preparing proposals for obtaining outside funds	2.95686	3.16418	.0947
6. Coordinating deliveries and returns of materials from the school district's center	3.70225	4.04167	.0273*
7. Coordinating deliveries and returns of materials from the regional service center	3.14567	3.60606	.0034*
8. Providing for use of materials through Interlibrary Loan, etc.	3.26275	3.73485	.0002*
10. Providing in-service education for staff	3.99625	4.38686	.0002*
16. Formulating policies for selecting print materials	3.90370	4.09155	.0248*
18. Providing for previewing materials	3.53309	3.72535	.0538*
19. Developing acquisition procedures for print materials	3.31298	3.78986	**
20. Developing acquisition procedures for audio-visual materials	3.17603	3.43662	.0232*

* Difference significant at the .05 or greater level.
** Statistic not used. See note, page 12.
*** Response category A: 0=Don't Know; 1=Little or No Responsibility; 2=Has Some Responsibility; 3=Has Considerable Responsibility; 4=Has Much Responsibility; 5=Has Complete Responsibility

principals showed the higher mean. They also, as a group, presented themselves as being more knowledgeable about librarian's roles and functions (see discussion of the Don't Know response on p.72). We are unable to explain why secondary principals reported higher levels of responsibility both actually and ideally for each of these statements.[1] Do secondary principals have more experience with librarians than do elementary principals? Do secondary principals regard the librarian as being more central to the school's functions and therefore being more important and more responsible? Is it that external pressures such as accreditation requirements have forced the secondary principal into a closer relationship with the library?

Statements 1, 2, 3, and 5 deal with planning and funding responsibilities. The highest actual means given in this group of statements were for statement 1, formulating long range plans for the library. Here we find that principals agreed that librarians have Considerable responsibility (about 3.0 on a 5.0 scale). However, as possible aspects of the responsibility for long range planning are made more specific in statements 2, 3, and 5, the responsibility level drops with each statement, with the lowest means given for preparing proposals for outside funding sources, statement 5. Although the principals disagreed significantly in their perceptions of the actual responsibility level for funding proposals, elementary principals placed it just below--and secondary, just above--the Some (2.0) responsibility level. It would appear that the Considerable responsibility attributed to librarians in formulating long range plans for the library was meant to apply only to the routines of school librarianship.

Secondary principals' perceptions of the ideal conditions for the planning statements placed the responsibility solidly into the Considerable-plus level, with

---

[1] As we reported in chapter IV, the differences between elementary and secondary librarians did not fall into such a uniform pattern.

elementary principals reporting lower levels which, nevertheless, exceeded Considerable. Principals did not differ significantly on the ideal for the funding statement, ranking it near the Considerable (3.0) level.

Statements 6, 7, and 8 concern liaison and networking responsibilities with agencies outside the local campus--the school district's center, the regional service center, and other libraries. Of the three responsibilities, the one which seems to be the most closely associated with the roles of the librarian--that of interlibrary loan--received the lowest actual rankings. Highest responsibility rankings both actually and ideally were given to statement 6, coordinating with the school district's center. Although the principals agreed that the actual responsibility for statement 6 was Considerable-plus, they disagreed on the Ideal; and they showed substantial disagreement on both the actual and ideal conditions for statements 7 and 8.

Of all the responsibility statements reported here, statement 10, providing in-service education for library staff, received the highest rankings both actually and ideally from each group of principals. There was also a highly significant difference in their respective perceptions. The frequency distribution (not reproduced here) shows that 47.45% of the secondary principals reported that their librarians have actual Complete responsibility in this area, compared with 29.73% of the elementary principals who assigned that level. For their ideal perceptions, 60.58% of the secondary principals but only 37.08% of the elementary principals, placed responsibility at the Complete level. Who is responsible for training library staff in the remaining schools? Or, are there no staff members or volunteers to be trained? Since many of the elementary schools represented in this survey have either irregular or infrequent services from a librarian responsible for several campuses, some of the problem may come as a result of this limited staffing. Perhaps the burden of recruiting and developing the volunteer staff--student or adult--is often carried by

the building principal in such schools.

Statements 16, 18, 19, and 20 concern previewing and acquiring materials for the library. Statement 16, formulating policies for selecting print materials, received Considerable-plus actual rankings from both groups, although secondary principals ranked it substantially higher. The rankings for statements 19 and 20, parallel statements on developing acquisition procedures for print materials and AV materials, respectively, suggest that secondary principals continue to see AV materials as items which are not wholly integrated into the traditional group of materials falling under the librarian's jurisdiction. Statement 19, print materials, received an actual ranking of 3.33 from secondary principals, compared with statement 20, AV materials, which received an actual ranking of 2.82--a half step lower. Although elementary principals did not make such a distinction between the two--giving statement 19 a 2.70 ranking and statement 20 a 2.56 ranking, they perceived both responsibilities at a lower level than secondary principals did and statement 19 at a much lower level.

A comparison of actual responsibility levels perceived by principals for their respective librarians results in the following picture, based on these significant statements. Neither group of librarians is perceived as having Much (4.0) actual responsibility in any of these areas; secondary librarians come closer with the rankings for statements 10 and 16. Secondary librarians are seen as having Considerable-plus (3.0+) responsibility on six of the twelve statements; elementary librarians are ranked above the 3.0 level on only three of the twelve statements.

The ideal rankings are similarly divided. Here secondary librarians are ranked at the 3.5 level or above for ten of the twelve statements, with Much responsibility (4.0) on three of those ten statements (6, 10, 16). On the other hand, elementary librarians--even at the ideal--are not ranked at the Much responsibility level on

any statement. On only 5 statements would their ideal responsibility level equal or exceed the 3.5 rank.

In connection with the elementary principals' relatively low ideal rankings, it is interesting to consider the distance between their reported actual conditions and their reported ideal conditions. Elementary principals appear to be more dissatisfied than secondary principals, since the gap between their actual means and their ideal means was greater for elementary principals than for secondary principals on 9 of the twelve statements. Secondary principals showed a larger gap on only one statement, number 6, coordinating deliveries and returns from the school district's center, and the two groups had equal gaps on statement 7, coordinating deliveries and returns from the regional service center, and 20, developing acquisition procedures for AV materials. What are elementary principals saying about their librarians? That they need more of their time? That they would like better performance but are not really expecting it, even under ideal circumstances? A follow-up to the current study is planned to compare responses from districts which have full-time elementary librarians in every school with those where one librarian serves two or more schools to see whether this may be the deciding factor.

Performance Area I

This Performance Area of the survey instrument consists of statements 24-40 and has the following scale to indicate frequency of performance of a given function: 0 (zero) = Don't Know; 1 = Never, Not at All; 2 = Infrequently; 3 = Sometimes; 4 = Frequently; 5 = Always, Systematically.

Ten of the seventeen statements in this Performance Area had rankings which differed significantly, and table 65 presents the data summary for those statements. Again we note that secondary principals gave higher rankings for each and every one of the significant statements both actually and ideally.

TABLE 65

Elementary principals vs. secondary principals

Results of analysis of variance on selected statements in performance area I***

Actual Condition

Role or function statements	Means		
	Elem. prin.	Sec. prin.	p
24. Disseminating information on the availability of resources	3.79259	4.06383	.0077*
27. Providing information on new teaching developments	2.33588	2.52555	.0985
28. Providing teachers with lists of materials useful in instruction	3.17910	3.46043	.0193*
30. Designing information systems	2.83267	3.19380	.0041*
31. Helping students choose appropriate materials	3.71642	4.01429	.0036*
33. Applying learning theories to the evaluation of materials	3.39662	3.65600	.0339*
34. Evaluating materials by utilizing suggestions from administrators and teachers	3.86090	4.15441	**
38. Applying basic research data to management	2.95918	3.38053	.0025*
39. Planning and conducting research projects	2.06373	2.51667	.0006*
40. Reading professional publications	3.82819	4.16667	**

* Difference significant at the .05 or greater level.
** Statistic not used. See note, page 12.
*** Response category B: 0=Don't Know; 1=Never; Not at All; 2=Infrequently; 3=Sometimes; 4=Frequently; 5=Always; Systematically

TABLE 65, continued

Elementary principals vs. secondary principals

Results of analysis of variance on selected statements in performance area I***

Ideal Condition

Role or function statements	Means		
	Elem. prin.	Sec. prin.	p
24. Disseminating information on the availability of resources	4.53137	4.68085	.0116*
27. Providing information on new teaching developments	3.28030	3.52206	.0367*
28. Providing teachers with lists of materials useful in instruction	4.11524	4.24286	.1456
30. Designing information systems	3.86719	4.09091	.0250*
31. Helping students choose appropriate materials	4.31734	4.43571	.0917
33. Applying learning theories to the evaluation of materials	4.16031	4.29231	.1252
34. Evaluating materials by utilizing suggestions from administrators and teachers	3.86090	4.15441	**
38. Applying basic research data to management	3.86404	4.22764	.0003*
39. Planning and conducting research projects	3.36123	3.66667	.0078*
40. Reading professional publications	4.42586	4.60432	.0063*

* Difference significant at the .05 or greater level.
** Statistic not used. See note, page 12.
*** Response category B: 0=Don't Know; 1=Never; Not at All; 2=Infrequently; 3=Sometimes; 4=Frequently; 5=Always; Systematically

Statements 24, 27, and 28 concern frequency with which information about library resources, information on new teaching developments, and bibliographies for teachers are distributed. Just as we saw an apparent hesitancy on the part of librarians in chapter 3 to "...provide information to teachers on new teaching developments and practices," we find here that principals agree that Infrequently-plus (2.0+) is the actual condition. Although they disagreed significantly on the ideal condition, each group of principals gave it the lowest ideal rankings of the ten statements in this section. It would appear that there are perceived territorial boundaries between the teacher and the librarian which would be violated by the librarian who assumed an aggressive role in this area. Since teachers commonly share with other teachers information of this nature which comes to their attention, there may be an implication here that the librarian is not considered a colleague either by the librarian or by the principals. Would teachers welcome this kind of information from librarians? Another study will have to answer that question.

The composite picture of the performance of the elementary librarian which emerges from the means given by the elementary principals is that of a person who is currently acting with significantly less frequency than secondary librarians on seven of the ten functions and with less frequency on the three remaining functions. At the ideal, elementary librarians would still be seen as performing with less frequency--significantly less on seven of the ten functions. We believe that these figures are the result of the lack of full-time librarian service at the campus level in many elementary schools.

Here, as with the responsibility statements discussed above, elementary principals exhibit greater dissatisfaction than secondary principals as evidenced by the fact that there is a greater gap between their actual mean score and their ideal mean

score on nine out of the ten statements. Only in the case of statement 27, providing information on new teaching practices, do secondary principals show a wider gap than do elementary principals between their actual and ideal means.

Performance Areas II and III

Performance Area II consists of statements 41-46 with response categories scaled to indicate the degree of provision made for each function or service: 0 (zero) = Don't Know; 1 = Makes No Provision; 2 = Makes Minimal Provision; 3 = Makes Partial Provision; 4 = Makes Substantial Provision; 5 = Makes Complete Provision.

Performance Area III consists of statements 47-57 and completes the survey instrument. The response scale is dichotomous: 0 (zero) = Don't Know; 1 = No; 5 = Yes. As explained in chapter 3, the computer was programmed to treat the 1 (Yes) responses as 5's and the 5 (No) responses as 1's to maintain the 1 lowest to 5 highest ranking values of the first 46 statements. Table 66 presents data summaries for statements in Performance Areas II and III in which elementary and secondary principals differed significantly in their rankings.

Again, secondary principals have ranked the level of provision higher in every case, and a greater percentage of secondary principals responded Yes to the dichotomous statements. And again, elementary principals' rankings suggest greater dissatisfaction with their current library service in that the gaps between their actual means and their ideal means are wider in six out of the seven statements than are the gaps for secondary principals, who showed slightly greater dissatisfaction on statement 46, providing for multi-cultural and multi-ethnic materials.

We conclude this consideration of the significant statements resulting from the comparison of responses from all secondary principals with those from all elementary principals with a series of questions: Are librarians roles and functions at the

TABLE 66

Elementary principals vs. secondary principals

Results of analysis of variance on selected statements in performance areas II & III

Actual Condition

Role or functions	***	Elem. prin.	Sec. prin.	p
41. Evaluating policies and procedures.	C	3.12602	3.54962	.0010*
43. Providing resources to support the curriculum	C	3.66917	3.94928	**
44. Providing materials to meet recreational needs	C	3.30888	3.58647	.0236*
45. Providing professional materials for teachers and administrators	C	3.16730	3.44286	.0153**
46. Providing multi-cultural and multi-ethnic materials	C	3.59690	3.74453	**
51. Providing access to print materials	D	4.82677	5.00000	.0148*
56. Applying instructional design principles to locally produced materials	D	3.33684	4.00000	.0057*

* Difference significant at the .05 or greater level.
** Statistic not used. See note page 12.
*** RESPONSE CATEGORIES:
C: 0=Don't Know; 1=Makes No Provision; 2=Makes Minimal Provision; 3=Makes Partial Provision; 4=Makes Substantial Provision; 5= Makes Complete Provision

D: 0=Don't Know; 1=No; 5=Yes

TABLE 66, continued

Elementary principals vs. secondary principals

Results of analysis of variance on selected statements in performance areas II & III

Ideal Condition

Role or function statements	**	Elem. prin.	Sec. Prin.	p
41. Evaluating policies and procedures.	C	4.07843	4.35971	.0002*
43. Providing resources to support the curriculum	C	4.30224	4.45714	.0235*
44. Providing materials to meet recreational needs	C	3.99245	4.12409	.1736
45. Providing professional materials for teachers and administrators	C	4.10821	4.22143	.1282
46. Providing multi-cultural and multi-ethnic materials	C	4.11610	4.27536	.0454*
51. Providing access to print materials	D	4.96970	5.00000	.3100
56. Applying instructional design principles to locally produced materials	D	4.68664	4.74775	.6165

* Difference significant at the .05 or greater level.

** RESPONSE CATEGORIES:

C: 0=Don't Know; 1=Makes No Provision; 2=Makes Minimal Provision; 3=Makes Partial Provision; 4=Makes Substantial Provision; 5=Makes Complete Provision

D: 0=Don't Know; 1=No; 5=Yes

elementary level less demanding than those at the secondary level? Apparently, elementary principals as a group see themselves currently as receiving less from their librarians and as ideally expecting less from their librarians than secondary principals receive and hope to receive. Apparently, also, elementary principals see a greater gap between what they are getting and what they'd like to get than do secondary principals. Is this perceived difference primarily (or solely?) a result of part-time service to so many of the elementary schools in the survey? Is it that elementary library service has received less attention in library education? Is it that the people who are attracted to elementary libraries are less competent than those who opt for secondary libraries? Is it that elementary principals don't know what their librarians are doing or what they should be doing and therefore were unable to respond as accurately as they might have otherwise? A total of twenty-nine statements were significant in this comparison. In only ONE case did the elementary principals as a group reach and exceed a rank of 4 on the actual condition--statement 51, providing access to print materials through a card catalog. Whether this situation indicates widespread dissatisfaction or widespread lack of information[1] is a question which cannot be answered by this study.

Urban Principals: Elementary vs. Secondary

The population of all principals discussed in the previous section consists primarily of principals from counties which are designated as urban. Therefore, the comparison between urban elementary and secondary principals yielded substantially the same statements with significant differences as did the previous comparison. Summary data for the six statements which were significant here but were not significant in the earlier comparison are presented in table 67.

---

[1] See discussion of Don't Know responses at the conclusion of chapter 3.

TABLE 67

Urban elementary principals vs.
urban secondary principals

Results of analysis of variance
on selected statements

Actual Condition

Role or function statements	**	Elem. prin.	Sec. prin.	p
1. Formulating long range plans	A	2.99609	3.24800	.0297*
5. Preparing proposals for obtaining outside funds	A	1.91163	2.34259	.0046*
36. Using the systems approach	B	3.17089	3.33708	.3125
40. Reading professional publications	B	3.82326	4.20721	.0007*
43. Providing resources to support the curriculum	C	3.69565	3.99174	.0051*
44. Providing materials to meet recreational needs	C	3.36179	3.64655	.0252*

* Difference significant at the .05 or greater level.

** RESPONSE CATEGORIES:

A: 0=Don't Know; 1=Has Little or No Responsibility; 2=Has Some Responsibility; 3=Has Considerable Responsibility; 4=Has Much Responsibility; 5=Has Complete Responsibility

B: 0=Don't Know; 1=Never, Not at All; 2= Infrequently; 3=Sometimes; 4=Frequently; 5=Always; Systematically

C: 0=Don't Know; 1=Makes No Provision; 2=Makes Minimal Provision; 3=Makes Partial Provision; 4=Makes Substantial Provision; 5=Makes Complete Provision

TABLE 67, continued

Urban elementary principals vs.
urban secondary principals

Results of analysis of variance
on selected statements

Ideal Condition

Role or function statements	***	Elem. prin.	Sec. prin.	p
1. Formulating long range plans	A	3.59533	3.83871	.0047*
5. Preparing proposals for obtaining outside funds	A	2.90417	3.17949	.0349*
36. Using the systems approach	B	3.17089	3.33708	.3125
40. Reading professional publications	B	4.42400	4.63964	**
43. Providing resources to support the curriculum	C	4.32157	4.47967	.0224*
44. Providing materials to meet recreational needs	C	4.01587	4.20833	.0443*

* Difference significant at the .05 or greater level.

** Statistic not used. See note, page 12.

*** RESPONSE CATEGORIES:

A: 0=Don't Know; 1=Has Little or No Responsibility; 2=Has Some Responsibility; 3=Has Considerable Responsibility; 4=Has Much Responsibility; 5-Has Complete Responsibility

B: 0=Don't Know; 1=Never, Not at All; 2=Infrequently; 3=Sometimes 4=Frequently; 5=Always; Systematically

C: 0=Don't Know; 1=Makes No Provision; 2=Makes Minimal Provision; 3=Makes Partial Provision; 4=Makes Substantial Provision; 5=Makes Complete Provision

Immediately apparent once again is the fact that urban secondary principals have assigned higher rankings for each of the statements both actually and ideally. And again, except for statement 36, using the systems approach, the gaps between the elementary principals' actual means and their ideal means are wider than the gaps for secondary principals.

Actually, statement 36 is the only one which did not appear at all in the previous section. Each of the others appeared earlier as significant on either the actual or ideal scales. For example, statement 1, long range planning, was significant on the ideal scale only earlier and here is significant on both scales.

Urban principals agreed that statement 36, using the systems approach for designing library services, is done Sometimes-plus (3.0+) by their librarians. Although they disagreed significantly on the ideal, they placed it at relatively high (4.30 and 4.05) levels.

Altogether, thirty statements provided evidence of significant differences between urban elementary principals' and urban secondary principals' perceptions of the roles and functions of librarians. There are more differences reported here than there are for the remaining two groups of principals.

All Principals: Large Districts vs. Small Districts

Responsibility

This section reports on the comparison of responses from 322 principals in large districts with responses from 96 principals in small districts. There were eight statements in which the rankings differed significantly in the Responsibility Area. Table 68 presents the data summary for these eight statements.

Statements 2, 3, 4, and 5 deal with planning and funding responsibilities of the campus level librarian. Principals in small districts report significantly higher actual and ideal levels of librarian responsibility in each of these areas than do

TABLE 68

Principals in large districts vs. principals in small districts

Results of analysis of variance on selected statements in responsibility area**

Actual Condition

Role or function statements	Means		
	Large	Small	p
2. Preparing the educational specifications for new facilities	2.31104	2.71111	.0055*
3. Planning for the floor design, furnishings, etc., for new facilities	2.14236	2.68889	.0002*
4. Planning facilities for local design and production	2.25850	2.56522	.0278*
5. Preparing proposals for obtaining outside funds	1.95057	2.47253	.0009*
9. Designing and conducting in-service programs for teachers	1.84665	1.60440	.0458*
13. Developing listening, viewing, and responding skills	2.12013	1.87097	.0377*
19. Developing acquisition procedures for print materials	2.87708	3.04255	.2953
22. Storing and scheduling of audio-visual equipment	3.47302	3.12632	.0447*

* Difference significant at the .05 or greater level.

** Response category A: 0=Don't Know; 1=Has Little or No Responsibility; 2=Has Some Responsibility; 3=Has Considerable Responsibility; 4=Has Much Responsibility; 5=Has Complete Responsibility

TABLE 68, continued

Principals in large districts vs. principals in small districts

Results of analysis of variance on selected statements in responsibility area**

Ideal Condition

Role or function statements	Means		
	Large	Small	p
2. Preparing the educational specifications for new facilities	3.41401	3.56383	.1319
3. Planning for the floor design, furnishings, etc., for new facilities	3.31847	3.60638	.0048*
4. Planning facilities for local design and production	3.29967	3.46237	.1293
5. Preparing proposals for obtaining outside funds	2.90847	3.40426	.0003*
9. Designing and conducting in-service programs for teachers	2.62540	2.43011	.1282
13. Developing listening, viewing, and responding skills	2.82903	2.64894	.1469
19. Developing acquisition procedures for print materials	3.41503	3.68085	.0336*
22. Storing and scheduling of audio-visual equipment	3.86478	3.78125	.5457

* Difference significant at the .05 or greater level.

** Response category A: 0=Don't Know; 1=Has Little or No Responsibility; 2=Has Some Responsibility; 3=Has Considerable Responsibility; 4=Has Much Responsibility; 5=Has Complete Responsibility

principals in large districts. Of the small district principals, 52.22% report librarians' responsibility for statement 2, preparing educational specifications for new library facilities, at the Considerable (3.0) and Much (4.0) levels, compared with 34.78% of the large district principals who assigned those levels. The actual level of responsibility for statement 3, planning for floor design, furnishings, etc., is ranked at the Much (4.0) or Complete (5.0) level by 38.89% of small district principals, compared with only 18.40% of the principals in large districts who placed it that high. Responsibility levels for statement 4, planning facilities for local design and production, were perceived at the Considerable (3.0) rank or above by 48.74% of the small district principals, but only 36.74% of the large district principals assigned those levels. Preparing proposals for outside funds, statement 5, is an area in which librarians have Little or No responsibility according to 54.75% of the principals in large districts and 36.26% of those in small districts. At the other end of the scale, however, 32.96% of small district principals place librarians' responsibility for preparing proposals at the Much or Complete levels, compared with only 17.49% of the principals in large districts who assigned those levels. Although librarians in small districts are perceived as having more responsibility in these areas, the mean scores for the actual condition never reach the Considerable (3.0) level. Nevertheless, the small districts appear to rely more heavily on campus level personnel in these areas than do the large districts. It should also be noted that there is a wider gap between the actual means and the ideal means given by the large districts than by the small districts for these statements.

Statement 9, designing and conducting in-service training programs for teachers, received the lowest actual and ideal rankings in this section from both groups. Although the large district principals ranked the actual responsibility significantly

higher, 80.51% of them said the librarians have Little/No (1.0) or Some (2.0) responsibility, and 84.62% of the small district principals agreed. Conducting in-service training for teachers appears to be a function which is viewed in the same way as providing information to teachers on new teaching developments and practices (statement 27, discussed above). In some ways, however, statement 9 represents a more crucial activity than does statement 27. Teachers who are given formal, well-prepared orientations to <u>their</u> library should be in better positions to interpret it to their students, to integrate it into their teaching, and to make the library more central to the entire educational program. Although the ideal levels here are low, there appears to be room for librarians to increase their activity in this area.

Statement 13, developing listening, viewing, and responding skills, received the next lowest means both actually and ideally, with principals in large districts significantly higher on the actual levels of responsibility.

The ideal for statement 19, developing procedures for acquisition of print materials, was ranked significantly higher (3.68 to 3.41) by small district principals, but the difference in their perceptions of the actual condition was not significant. Their ideal rankings were at the Considerable-plus level, and the gap between the actual and ideal means given by the small district principals was wider than that of the larger district principals. The presence in many of the large districts of library supervisors who have a large share of the responsibility for developing acquisition procedures probably explains the lower means of the large district principals and their narrower actual-ideal gap.

Statement 22 concerns the librarian's responsibility for the storage and scheduling of AV equipment. Principals agreed that the ideal level is just short of Much responsibility but disagreed in their perceptions of the actual condition. Principals in large districts ranked the actual condition higher, with 74.61% of them

reporting the responsibility level at 3.0 and above, compared with only 61.06% of the small district principals who assigned those levels.

It would appear at this point that the principals in large and small districts are confirming the pattern noted earlier for the librarians in large and small districts. The small district librarians gave higher rankings to management-related responsibilities and functions, and the large district librarians gave higher rankings to the service-related responsibilities and functions. The same division appears here in the perceptions of their respective principals.

Performance Areas I and III

The rankings of four statements in Performance Area I, and one statement in Performance Area III differed significantly. Table 69 presents the data summary for these statements.

Principals in large districts assigned higher actual levels of performance to each of these statements and higher ideal levels to all except statement 50, organizing and classifying audio-visual materials. Statements 25, 26, and 31 are representative of service-related activities, and they are all ranked at Sometimes-plus (3.0+) by both groups of principals on the actual scale. Although the principals disagreed significantly in their perceptions of the ideal for these three statements, both groups ranked the ideal in excess of 4.0 on the 5 point scale.

Statement 29, participating on curriculum planning committees, cannot be neatly designated as either service-related or management-related, rather it is faculty-related. It was suggested earlier that the low rankings on statements 9 and 27 may indicate that the librarian is not perceived as a full faculty member. The rankings for statement 29 are low enough here to raise the question again--the mean rankings for the actual condition do not reach 3.0. On the ideal scale, the librarian would participate less often than Frequently (4.0) according to the principals'

TABLE 69

Principals in large districts vs. principals in small districts

Results of analysis of variance on selected statements in performance areas I & III

Actual Condition

Role or function statements	***	Large	Small	p
25. Promoting the library's collections and services	B	3.82650	3.52128	**
26. Disseminating information on effective use of materials and equipment	B	3.53312	3.22581	**
29. Participating on curriculum planning committees	B	2.76351	2.42697	.0237*
31. Helping students choose appropriate materials	B	3.85669	3.69149	.1537
50. Organizing and classifying audio-visual materials	D	4.23596	3.60000	.0028*

Ideal Condition

Role or function statements	***	Large	Small	p
25. Promoting the library's collections and services	B	4.51887	4.36170	.0400*
26. Disseminating information on effective use of materials and equipment	B	4.31447	4.10753	.0123*
29. Participating on curriculum planning committees	B	3.81553	3.63333	.1243
31. Helping students choose appropriate materials	B	4.40063	4.21277	.0175*
50. Organizing and classifying audio-visual materials	D	4.70629	4.72727	.8684

* Difference significant at the .05 or greater level.
** Statistic not used. See note, page 12.
*** RESPONSE CATEGORIES:
B: 0=Don't Know; 1=Never, Not at All; 2=Infrequently; 3=Sometimes; 4=Frequently; 5=Always; Systematically
D: 0=Don't Know; 1=No; 5=Yes

rankings. It appears then that many librarians still need to convince administrators that they are indeed faculty members who wish to function as faculty.

Principals disagreed significantly in their perceptions of the actual condition in regard to statement 50, organizing and classifying audio-visual materials. Of the large district principals, 80.90% responded that the materials were so organized, compared with only 65.00% of the small district principals. They did not disagree significantly in their perceptions of the ideal.

All Principals: Urban vs. Rural

Responsibility Area

This section compares responses from 386 urban principals with responses from 32 rural principals. Seven statements from the Responsibility Area differed significantly in this comparison, and table 70 presents the data summary.

Statements 3 and 5 concern planning and funding responsibilities of the librarian, and rural principals ranked each of them higher both actually and ideally--significantly higher on the actual condition for statement 3 and on the ideal for statement 5. Of the rural principals, 42.86% ranked librarians' actual responsibility for planning for floor design, furnishings, etc., at the Much (4.0) or Complete (5.0) levels, compared with only 21.72% of the urban principals who designated those levels. Similarly, 56.26% of the rural principals--but only 38.09% of the urban principals--indicated that librarians would ideally have Much or Complete responsibility for preparing proposals for outside funds. Rural districts generally have fewer personnel and, as a result, appear to rely more heavily on them than do urban districts.

Although principals agreed that librarians' actual responsibility for statement 11, producing materials locally, was at the Some-plus (3.0) level, they disagreed significantly in their perceptions of the ideal. Of the rural principals, 62.50% ranked the ideal at the Much or Complete levels, compared with only 39.84% of the

TABLE 70

Principals in urban districts vs. principals in rural districts

Results of analysis of variance on selected statements in the responsibility area**

Actual Condition

Role or function statements	Means		
	Urban	Rural	p
3. Planning for the floor design, furnishings, etc., for new facilities	2.23429	2.75000	.0327*
5. Preparing proposals for obtaining outside funds	2.05573	2.38710	.1758
11. Producing materials	2.20588	2.28125	.7376
16. Formulating policies for selecting print materials	3.47895	3.90625	.0460*
17. Evaluating and selecting audio-visual equipment	2.60950	2.09375	.0235*
19. Developing acquisition procedures for print materials	2.89532	3.15625	.2903
22. Storing and scheduling of audio-visual equipment	3.44180	2.81250	.0204*

* Difference significant at the .05 or greater level.

** Response category A: 0=Don't Know; 1=Has Little or No Responsibility; 2=Has Some Responsibility; 3=Has Considerable Responsibility; 4=Has Much Responsibility; 5=Has Complete Responsibility

TABLE 70, continued

Principals in urban districts vs. principals in rural districts

Results of analysis of variance on selected statements in the responsibility area**

Ideal Condition

Role or function statements	Means		
	Urban	Rural	p
3. Planning for the floor design, furnishings, etc., for new facilities	3.36605	3.6129	.1306
5. Preparing proposals for obtaining outside funds	2.99440	3.40625	.0548*
11. Producing materials	3.07487	3.65625	.0064*
16. Formulating policies for selecting print materials	3.95000	4.18750	.1105
17. Evaluating and selecting audio-visual equipment	3.23622	2.96875	.1579
19. Developing acquisition procedures for print materials	3.34750	3.93750	.0104*
22. Storing and scheduling of audio-visual equipment	3.85864	3.68750	.4334

* Difference significant at the .05 or greater level.

** Response category A: 0=Don't Know; 1=Has Little or No Responsibility; 2=Has Some Responsibility; 3=Has Considerable Responsibility; 4=Has Much Responsibility; 5=Has Complete Responsibility

urban principals who assigned those levels.

Statements 16 and 19 deal with policies and procedures for selecting and acquiring print materials, and rural principals ranked librarians' responsibility levels higher on both the actual and ideal--signiiicantly higher on the actual condition for statement 16 and on the ideal condition for statement 19. Here, again, we are probably seeing the influence of the large urban districts' library supervisors who assume some of the responsibility in the urban districts that, in the rural districts, remainswith the campus librarian.

Statements 17 and 22 concern evaluating, selecting, storing and scheduling of AV equipment; and urban principals assigned significantly higher actual levels of librarian responsibility for these functions than did rural principals. Both groups of principals perceive librarians as having more responsibility for storage and scheduling than for evaluating and selecting AV equipment. Apparently, however, actual practice in many of the rural districts places AV equipment outside the jurisdiction of the librarian. According to information gained from the superintendent interviews, the principals themselves often assume this responsibility.

Performance Areas I, II, and III

Seven statements in Performance Area I, four statements in Performance Area II, and one statement in Performance Area III showed significant differences in this comparison. Table 71 presents a data summary for these statements.

Urban principals ranked librarians' actual performance significantly higher on ten of the twelve statements. Once again, the lowest actual rankings assigned by each group are reserved for the librarians' frequency of participation on curriculum planning committees. Of the rural principals, 32.14% reported that their librarians Never participate, as did 20.73% of the urban principals.

Otherwise, however, urban principals perceived their librarians' performance

TABLE 71

Principals in urban districts vs. principals in rural districts

Results of analysis of variance on selected statements in performance areas I, II, & III

Actual Condition

Role or function statements	**	Urban	Rural	p
25. Promoting the library's collections and services	B	3.79790	3.23333	.0060*
26. Disseminating information on effective use of materials and equipment	B	3.50789	2.90000	.0018*
29. Participating on curriculum planning committees	B	2.72269	2.21429	.0353*
33. Applying learning theories to the evaluation of materials	B	3.50299	3.28571	.3139
34. Evaluating materials by utilizing suggestions from administrators and teachers	B	3.98928	3.58621	.0365*
37. Gathering statistical data	B	3.08766	2.45833	.0248*
38. Applying basic research data to management	B	3.15278	2.57143	.0298*
43. Providing resources to support the curriculum	C	3.79144	3.43333	.0526*
44. Providing materials to meet recreational needs	C	3.45304	2.80000	.0027*
45. Providing professional materials for teachers and administrators	C	3.29144	2.89655	.0597
46. Providing multi-cultural and multi-ethnic materials	C	3.68207	3.18519	.0132*
52. Providing access to audio-visual materials	D	4.29683	3.50000	.0062*

* Difference significant at the .05 or greater level.

** RESPONSE CATEGORIES:

B: 0=Don't Know; 1=Never; Not at All; 2=Infrequently; 3=Sometimes; 4=Frequently; 5=Always; Systematically

C: 0=Don't Know; 1=Makes No Provision; 2=Makes Minimal Provision; 3=Makes Partial Provision; 4=Makes Substantial Provision; 5=Makes Complete Provision

D: 0=Don't Know; 1=No; 5=Yes

TABLE 71, continued

Principals in urban districts vs. principals in rural districts

Results of analysis of variance on selected statements in performance areas I, II, & III

Ideal Condition

Role or function statements	***	Urban	Rural	p
25. Promoting the library's collections and services	B	4.49476	4.33333	.1921
26. Disseminating information on effective use of materials and equipment	B	4.28609	4.00333	.0578
29. Participating on curriculum planning committees	B	3.78649	3.62069	.3856
33. Applying learning theories to the evaluation of materials	B	4.22715	3.93548	.0519*
34. Evaluating materials by utilizing suggestions from administrators and teachers	B	4.48276	4.22581	.0298*
37. Gathering statistical data	B	3.98521	3.96154	.8956
38. Applying basic research data to management	B	4.00308	3.84615	.3976
43. Providing resources to support the curriculum	C	4.37302	4.13333	**
44. Providing materials to meet recreational needs	C	4.07796	3.53333	**
45. Providing professional materials for teachers and administrators	C	4.17196	3.83333	.0122*
46. Providing multi-cultural and multi-ethnic materials	C	4.19149	3.89655	**
52. Providing access to audio-visual materials	D	4.75691	4.75000	.9689

* Difference significant at the .05 or greater level.

** Statistic not used. See note, page 12.

*** RESPONSE CATEGORIES:

A: 0=Don't Know; 1=Never; Not at All; 2=Infrequently; 3=Sometimes; 4=Frequently; 5=Always Systematically

C: 0=Don't Know; 1=Makes No Provision; 2=Makes Minimal Provision; 3=Makes Partial Provision; 4=Makes Substantial Provision; 5=Makes Complete Provision

D: 0=Don't Know; 1=No; 2=Yes

at the 3-plus level for each of the remaining eleven statements, with high rankings (3.6+) going to statement 25, promoting the library's collection and services; statement 34, utilizing suggestions from administrators and teachers; statement 43, providing resources in support of the curricular program; statement 46, providing multi-cultural and multi-ethnic materials; and statement 52, providing access to AV materials through a card catalog or other records.

Rural principals, on the other hand, ranked six of the twelve statements below the three level, and no performance statement was ranked as high as 3.6. Only statements 34, evaluating materials by utilizing suggestions from administrators and teachers, and 52, providing access to AV materials, received rankings as high as 3.5 from the rural principals.

Rural principals indicated greater dissatisfaction with the current level of librarian performance. The gaps between their actual means and their ideal means were wider than those for urban principals in eleven out of the twelve statements. Only on statement 33, applying learning theories to the evaluation of materials, did urban principals show greater dissatisfaction. As was the case with many elementary principals in this study, rural principals typically share the services of one librarian with other schools in their district. Therefore it is not surprising that there are wider gaps between their perceived actual conditions and their perceived ideals.

The next chapter presents the results of interviews with a sample of fifteen superintendents drawn from those who had responded to the survey.

CHAPTER VI

SUPERINTENDENT INTERVIEWS

Introduction

Interviews with school district superintendents or their designates[1] were held between March 26, 1976, and April 24, 1976. A stratified random sample of the seventy-two respondents to the initial questionnaire was drawn to provide the names of ten urban and six rural districts in which to request interviews with the superintendent or his representative. Superintendent interest in the study was evidenced by the fact that only one substitution from the initial sample was required and only one interview had to be cancelled.

The investigators developed an open-ended interview schedule designed to gain responses to major findings and to elicit suggestions for desirable courses of action to correct perceived problems. Specifically, we wanted information of the following nature: (1) What explanation(s) could superintendents give for some of the more significant findings? (2) How did the superintendents perceive the librarian's role in, for example, planning? (3) Did superintendents see need for changes? If so, what suggestions would they offer for producing those changes?

Each interview began with a review of the study's purpose and results. Then the purpose of the interview, as given in the letter requesting the interview, was restated: "...to obtain reaction to major findings and seek advisement on possible actions which might be desirable." Interview areas included (1) planning, (2) applying for funds, (3) participation on curriculum planning committees, (4) selecting materials and equipment, (5) developing listening, viewing, and responding skills,

---

[1] The term superintendent will be used hereinafter as a matter of convenience. A list of those interviewed, along with position titles, is given in Appendix III.

and (6) network liaison.

Interview Results

Planning.--The first area of inquiry dealt with perceptions of librarians' actual level of responsibility for planning in the areas of educational specifications for new or remodeled library facilities, floor design, furnishings, etc., (survey statements 2 and 3) and for planning for facilities for local design and production of learning resources (survey statement 4). To provide background, the interviewer summarized the findings on planning essentially as follows: "In their perceptions of the actual level of responsibility, librarians ranked themselves significantly lower than principals who, in turn, ranked librarian responsibility lower than superintendents did. Survey statement 2, for example, had a mean for librarians of 2.15, for principals of 2.40, and for superintendents of 2.91 on a 1 (lowest) to 5 (highest) scale. Survey statements 3 and 4 were ranked similarly."

Given this introductory information, the superintendent was then asked: "What do you think about the way these rankings line up?" Suitable follow-up questions were asked as necessary to focus attention on the librarian's role in planning.

A few of the superintendents saw the low rankings that librarians had assigned to themselves as quite understandable. One said succinctly, "They put themselves out of it, didn't they? That's not surprising." Another from a small rural district said, "Some librarians are just not organized at all, just can't manage well. When remodeling was done here, we just went ahead; we didn't ask her. It wouldn't have done any good."

Two superintendents explained the rankings by surmising that if most of the answers were premised on hypothetical rather than real situations the differences

should be expected. As one put it, "Administrators are being made more and more aware of the need for involvement from the grass roots level and may tend to give higher rankings because of this consciousness."

The initial reaction was generally surprise, however, with comments such as, "Why, it [the sequence of the mean scores for the actual condition] is inverted, isn't it!" One of the more knowledgeable superintendents thought that librarians' lack of experience, training, initiative, or perhaps some combination of the three, were possible factors that would account for the sequence. His rhetorical question seemed appropriate: "Where else would one go for this information if not to the librarian?"

Another administrator in a large urban district thought that the low level of librarian involvement in planning occurs because "Administrators are hesitant to ask people who are already very busy to come to after-school meetings, but there would be no problem with librarians getting into planning sessions if they wanted to."

Two of the strongest positive interview responses were from superintendents in small districts. One explained that his "lead librarian" of twelve years does all library budget planning and did all the planning for a recently constructed elementary school library. The superintendent then said, with considerable feeling: "I was here ten years before we hired [the current librarian], and it was a relief to get someone to take care of it." He added that he wanted to delegate responsibility and had a great deal of confidence in his librarian: "She is willing to take hold, to take charge. She has reasons for what she wants and sees that it is used when she gets it." The other superintendent explained that he didn't see how his district could possibly get along without its librarian. As for planning, "She doesn't wait to be told; she comes to find out. This is a strength of her person-

ality. We don't say yes to everything, but she just keeps coming back."

Superintendents in small schools did not think that it would be necessary for librarians to set about in a formal way to determine administrative expectations for their role in planning. For example, in one small rural situation where the superintendent and the librarian had worked together for several years, the superintendent felt that the district's small size facilitated communications and that everybody understood what was expected, "but if we got a brand new lady (or man) we would need to talk to her or to him more."

Superintendents, when asked where the librarians fit in, gave some interesting responses: "Librarians could take more initiative," said one, "if they would go about it in the right way." Another response was that "Some people in the school business--coaches, department heads, not just the librarian--wouldn't get their requests no matter what. Those who come in and pound the desk and say 'We need this' are not going to get anywhere." Nearly every one of the superintendents stressed that librarians need to be reasonable in their requests and aware of budget constraints.

Applying for funds.--The second interview area concerned the low level of the rankings assigned to librarians for the actual condition on survey statement 5, "When funds are available from sources outside the local district, the librarian has responsibility for preparing proposals for obtaining them." Superintendents' means were 2.05, principals' 1.96, and librarians' 1.78. With this background information, the funding area was introduced by the investigator as follows: "Take the ESEA Title IV fund applications for instance, who is responsible for supplying information for making them here in (name of school district)?" If necessary, a follow-up question asked "Where do you see the librarian fitting into this?"

It soon became clear that superintendents do not consider funding to be a

campus level librarian's function. Concensus was that applications to regularly recurring sources, such as ESEA funds, should be handled at the district level with librarian input. In one instance the statement that it was not the librarian's job to apply for funds was softened by the qualification that "librarians should be responsible for fund proposals from non-standard sources."

Participation on curriculum planning committees.--The third interview area considered the findings on survey statement 29, "The librarian participates on curriculum planning committees." This statement was in a section of the questionnaire with responses scaled to indicate frequency of occurrence from 1 (Never; Not at All) to 5 (Always; Systematically). Nearly half (44.44%) of the librarians reporting on this statement said they NEVER participate on curriculum planning committees, but 90.47 percent of them see the ideal situation as one where they would participate at least Sometimes (3 on the 5 point scale). Superintendents were then asked: "Why do you think this is? Why don't more librarians get onto curriculum planning committees?"

Interviewed superintendents supported the librarians' contentions that they are not ordinarily included on curriculum committees. Indeed, only two superintendents, both in small urban districts, stated firmly, unequivocally, that their librarians did participate in this way; and one of these librarians was in a school where the faculty served as a committee of the whole. In the other district, the superintendent reported that librarians were involved in all aspects of curriculum development from needs assessment on; for example, they have been heavily involved in developing English curriculum mini-units, and they work closely with counselors.

Among the rest of the interviewed superintendents, the reasons for non-participation varied widely. At one extreme were those represented by the rural superintendent who thought very highly of his librarian but said flatly, "It would be a waste

of her time. The only way our librarian gets involved in curriculum is in getting suggestions from teachers. We're small enough so she can learn what she needs without going to faculty curriculum meetings." Another pro-librarian superintendent of a small rural school district did not put the librarian on curriculum committees because "The librarian has so much extra stuff that you hate to put more on her--she's a hard worker, and does a lot already."

A large urban district superintendent replied in a similar vein with "How much are they willing to do beyond the regular school hours? Principals would not hesitate [to ask librarians to serve on curriculum planning committees] if they did not think it was an imposition." This particular district pays extra for curriculum development, "and the budget is tight, so specialists may not be involved as much as they should be.... The supply of materials is not given its proper place in curriculum development, however."

Representing the other extreme were two superintendents who placed blame for non-participation on the librarians themselves. One, from a large urban district, was "not surprised it's not ranked higher. When in-service day comes, they [librarians] go off by themselves instead of going to the Language Arts session. Actually they are welcome to go to other curriculum meetings, too, but I don't know of any way to get them to be more active participants." The other superintendent, from a small urban district, attributes librarians non-participation to "lack of communication. The librarians should take the initiative to go to the teachers, but they don't. When we revised curriculum recently, some teachers had to identify related library materials themselves. Librarians should know the materials, and levels, and what is available. Maybe it's easier just to stay in the library than it is to function as a faculty member!"

Three superintendents thought administrators were remiss in not involving

librarians in curriculum planning. As one put it, even though "it is not the librarians' function to be co-equal in formulating the original objectives, they should be brought in earlier than they generally are to advise on shifts of materials which might be occasioned by changes in grade placement or sequence."

If librarians are to function as members of the professional staff in schools, it is essential that they be involved in curriculum planning and development. This means some librarians will have to quit getting satisfaction from having people say "look at our poor, overworked librarian, she is doing so much we couldn't ask her to do any more." Some will have to be more assertive and say "I would like to attend the curriculum planning sessions because I need to be there to do my job right, and you need me there to do the curriculum planning right." And for many librarians it will mean taking the time and the effort to learn about approaches to instructional design so they can be contributing participants in the process.

Selecting materials and equipment: small districts (urban & rural).--Survey statements 15, 16, 17, and 18 deal with various aspects of responsibility for selecting materials and equipment. All three groups who responded to the questionnaire survey--principals, superintendents, and librarians--ranked the degree of responsibility in this area in the following descending order: at the top was selection policies for print materials (statement 16); next, provision for previewing materials (statement 18); then, selection policies for AV materials (statement 15); and at the bottom, selection of AV equipment (statement 17). This ranking was consistent in the responses for both actual and ideal conditions. After the foregoing background, superintendents were asked: "How do you account for this hierarchy?" When it was necessary, these follow-up questions were asked: "Who does select AV materials and equipment? How does the librarian fit into this situation?"

Responses to this question by superintendents from small districts varied widely. One point of view was expressed emphatically by a superintendent who is proud of his position on selection generally: "Teachers need to select materials and equipment, not me or the librarian; otherwise, it'll never be used." Subsequent discussion with the high school librarian confirmed his statement: the librarian allocated library materials funds equally among the teachers, retaining one share for mop-up buying. Another point of view, more widely held, is represented by another superintendent who replied, "Yes, I can tell you why that ranking exists--the AV materials are all in the principal's office, along with the AV equipment and the region service center catalogs. It's always been that way." The interviewer's reaction must have been evident, because the superintendent went on to add, "She [the librarian] stays busy without it, you know, and besides there isn't room for it in the library; and staff is not available to cover the library at all times."

The reason given for the low responsibility levels in the audio-visual area by one articulate superintendent from a small rural district was that "librarians have a poor image of themselves--a lack of confidence; and the superintendent does not ordinarily see this as a librarian's job. Even the reading resources are bought through reading resources teachers in our situation, where the librarian is here only two days a week."

At the other extreme in small urban school districts were two superintendents who could see no correspondence between the rankings and their situations. One said, "We treat it all the same--it's all in the library and under the librarian's charge. The principals have too many other responsibilities." Another responded, "The librarian has the budget--she spends it, not the superintendent. That's what she is hired to do." As one might expect, both of these superintendents had excellent

librarians who had assumed full professional responsibility.

Selecting materials and equipment: Large districts (urban & rural).--Superintendents or assistant superintendents from large districts (ten or more campuses) gave very consistent and candid explanations for the rankings. Consider the following comments:

(1) "Traditionally, the librarian takes care of reading materials, using selection aids such as 'best' lists for books; but subject specialists' input is more necessary in AV selection."

(2) "Principals are in charge of AV materials and equipment and have been, historically. It would take some adjustment on the principals' part to accommodate the Learning Resources Center and the Learning Resources Specialist concept."

(3) "This hierarchy represents what we have been doing. Since equipment needs to be standardized across the district and must be put out for bids, it's pretty well taken out of the librarians' hands. The librarian's training, interest, and background has not been in [audiovisual] equipment and materials. I'm not saying that's sex related; it's just that their training and security is weaker in that area."

(4) "It's that way as a matter of course because books were first, and AV came later; and we tend to think of a librarian dealing with books and the rest will come gradually. Currently the principal assumes a larger share of the responsibility because the money [for AV equipment and materials] is not allocated to the library budget. Besides, the librarian herself does not see this as her job--equipment is expensive; and she would need to see about getting it to fit [pause] and she just doesn't want the responsibility."

It would appear that library tradition, media history, and possibly, sex role stereotyping have combined to deprive AV equipment and materials of a "home." Here, the librarian tends them; there, the principal; elsewhere, another faculty member is in charge. Since selecting and maintaining AV materials and equipment is central to the concept of the Learning Resources Center, pre-service and in-service education for the Learning Resources Specialist and all other school personnel must recognize and support the L.R.S.'s responsibility in this area.

Developing listening, viewing, reading, and responding skills.--Statements 13

and 14 ask about the responsibility of librarians for developing student skills in listening, viewing, reading, and responding. All three groups see a surprisingly low level of responsibility (Little or None to Some-plus) on both the actual and the ideal scales. All groups agreed that both actually and ideally librarians have more responsibility for developing listening and viewing skills than for developing reading skills. As might be expected, secondary librarians ranked these activities lower than elementary librarians did. Given this introduction, superintendents were asked about responsibility for developing these skills and how the librarian fits in.

A typical superintendent comment was "This is partly the librarian's job, too, especially in the elementary grades. I'm surprised it is not [ranked] higher." Another said, "Librarians definitely need these skills in order to establish the teacher-librarian cooperation needed in getting books and so on to the kids. When you have this cooperation, then library skills instruction gets the support it needs."

In one district, after considerable discussion of the wording of the statements, the superintendent suggested that the response might have been higher if the wording had been changed from "the librarian has responsibility for developing listening, viewing, and responding skills of students" to "The librarian has responsibility for helping teachers develop the listening... skills of students."[1]

One superintendent said he didn't know the level of the librarian's responsibility, and we went to his librarian to get the answer from her. She said, "My responsibility? Do you want me to be honest? This is outside my area completely--definitely a 1 (Never; Not at all) rank."

---

[1] See page 33, supra, for further discussion of this point.

This is clearly an area in which the actual condition in many schools differs markedly from policy statements of the profession.

Network laison.--Three survey statements--6, 7, and 8--ask for information on three facets of the campus level librarian's responsibility for providing coordination with, and access to, resources from beyond the local campus. Resources specifically mentioned in the statements include the Regional Service Center, the public library, the State's library network, community resources, and the school district learning resources center. Librarians are performing fairly well in their coordination with the school district's center (where there is one), and that area was not discussed with superintendents. Superintendents were asked, however, to comment on the low rankings for the actual condition reported for laison with the Regional Service Center--Superintendent's means were 2.21, principals' 2.61, librarians' 2.58--and for interlibrary loan responsibilities--superintendents' means were 2.35, principals' 2.40, librarians' 2.50.

The introductory question, "Do you have any idea why these rankings are so low, Superintendent _____?" was followed, if necessary, by "Who serves in this district as the link between your campus and the Education Service Center?" and/or "What about having the school librarian serve as a link to public libraries?"

Regional Service Center policy calls for a building coordinator for each campus. It would seem logical that the librarian would serve in this capacity, since much of the service provided involves learning resources. While librarians often do act as laison, this duty is assumed by the principal in many schools. The principal is always on duty and is often in charge of the building AV anyway.

The question of public library laison prompted discussion of the Community Library concept in three interviews. One superintendent in a small rural town said that communication with the public is needed: "It's a shame to shut it [the school's

library] down in the summer. It takes a certain kind of person to make it interesting to the public, though. We want our people to read with their kids, and a good librarian could help on this." One small school superintendent was very positive in his response: "I'd like to see even more done. I'd like to see her [the librarian] open the school library to the public a few hours a week to see how it would work." Comments on more adequate utilization of existing resources are typified by the superintendent from a large urban district who said: "Using the public library and other community resources is up to the teachers as things stand now, but the librarians should do more than they are." Here, is, again, an area in which librarians should be able to perform in a unique and useful way to provide access to additional sources of learning materials.

Means for Improvement Suggested by the Superintendent Interviews

In-service education.--In-service education was the method most generally mentioned as the vehicle for bringing about improvement. Suggested audiences for whom in-service education should be designed included the librarians, the teachers, and the school administrators. One interview respondent suggested that the instrument used in Actual and Ideal Roles and Functions could serve as a needs assessment, with in-service education modules developed in response to the needs so identified: planning, curriculum development, multi-cultural/multi-ethnic materials, etc.

Pre-service education.--Changes in pre-service education were also suggested. There were those who felt that the new certification plan, with its greater specificity, was very much needed for the librarians. One superintendent volunteered that administrators need to know more about all special area teachers--counselors, nurses, etc., as well as librarians; and he suggested that Schools of Education should have a course for this purpose.

Demonstration libraries.--Demonstration libraries were suggested by one superintendent. He felt that superintendents are, of necessity, fiscally oriented, and probably not as aware as they should be of the place of learning resources centers in the schools. Visits to demonstration libraries representative of different sized districts might produce greater awareness in administration and other school personnel. He suggested that this might well be handled through the Education Service centers.

Outreach.--A final suggestion for bringing about improvement is the result of participation by this investigator in the study generally and in the interviews in particular. The communication with superintendents and their assistants has been useful in several instances in explaining the value of appropriate participation by librarians in such activities as planning and in curriculum development. These and other non-clerical roles and functions which form part of the librarian's job need to be outlined to school administrators on a one-to-one basis as opportunities present themselves.

CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

New standards and new certification requirements have increased the expectations for the level of involvement of school media center personnel in such areas as planning, accessing networks, instructional design, curriculum development, and production of learning resources. This research study was conducted to provide information about the actual and the desired performance of school librarians so that pre-service education, in-service education, and the management of school media centers might be improved.

An attempt was made to answer the following questions: (1) How well are librarians currently performing? How close are they coming to an ideal level of performance? (2) Do school administrators and school librarians agree on the current and future importance of the roles and functions set forth in the newly adopted certification requirements for learning resources specialists (librarians)? (3) Do various sub-groups of librarians and principals agree on the current and future importance of these roles and functions? (4) Are there roles and functions which are not understood by large numbers of librarians and/or administrators?

A questionnaire based on the 1976 certification requirements for Texas learning resources specialists (school librarians) was used to provide data. The questionnaire contained 57 statements such as "The librarian participates on curriculum planning committees." Response was obtained regarding perceptions of both the actual and the ideal condition for each statement, thus generating 114 items for study. Response scales for statements 1-46 consisted of five-point

low to high progressions with an additional "Don't know" option. The response scale for statements 57-57 consisted of "Yes," "No," and the "Don't Know" option.

A total of 814 (62%) of the surveys distributed were returned in usable condition. Principals and librarians completed all items; superintendents completed only items 1-46 (librarians' responsibility area), since superintendents were presumed not to have direct knowledge of the librarians' performance functions represented by items 47-114. Follow-up interviews were conducted with a stratified random sample of fifteen superintendents drawn from the 72 superintendents who responded to the survey.

The t-test for correlated samples was used to compare the perceived actual condition with the perceived ideal condition for each statement. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to test the agreement or disagreement between respondent groups and subgroups on the following hypotheses:

Null Hypothesis 1.--H_o: No significant rank difference exists between the librarian's roles and functions considered desirable by superintendents and those considered desirable by librarians.

Null Hypothesis 2.--H_o: No significant rank difference exists between the librarian's roles and functions considered desirable by principals and those considered desirable by librarians.

Null Hypothesis 3.--H_o: No Significant rank difference exists between the librarian's roles and functions considered desirable by superintendents and those considered desirable by principals.

Null Hypothesis 4.--H_o: No significant rank difference exists between the librarian's roles and functions considered desirable by superintendents in urban schools and those considered desirable by superintendents in rural schools.

Null Hypothesis 5.--H_o: No significant rank difference exists between the librarian's roles and functions considered desirable by superintendents in large school districts and those considered desirable by superintendents in small school districts.

Null Hypothesis 6.--H_o: No significant rank difference exists between the librarian's roles and functions considered desirable by all secondary school principals and those considered desirable by all elementary school principals.

Null Hypothesis 7.--H_o: No significant rank difference exists between the librarian's roles and functions considered desirable by urban secondary school principals and those considered desirable by urban elementary school principals.

Null Hypothesis 8.--H_o: No significant rank difference exists between the librarian's roles and functions considered desirable by principals of large school districts and those considered desirable by principals of small school districts.

Null Hypothesis 9.--H_o: No significant rank difference exists between the librarian's roles and functions considered desirable by all urban school principals and those considered desirable by all rural school principals.

Null Hypothesis 10.--H_o: No significant rank difference exists between the librarian's roles and functions considered desirable by all secondary school librarians and those considered desirable by all elementary school librarians.

Null Hypothesis 11.--H_o: No significant rank difference exists between the librarian's roles and functions considered desirable by urban secondary school librarians and those considered desirable by urban elementary school librarians.

Null Hypothesis 12.--H_o: No significant rank difference exists between the librarian's roles and functions considered desirable by librarians of large school districts and those considered desirable by librarians in small school districts.

Summary of Findings

T-Test

How close are we coming to the ideal? The t-test for correlated samples shows the ideal ranking to be significantly higher than the actual ranking for every statement responded to by superintendents, principals, and librarians. There is not one role or function included in this study which is now being carried out as well as respondents think it should be.

Within this general shortfall in the performance of librarians, the study shows that perceived gaps between actual and ideal are greater for elementary principals than for secondary principals. Librarians generally have a greater difference than administrators between their actual and ideal means on management functions such as planning. Conversely, on service functions such as providing materials for teachers, it is generally the administrators who show the greater difference between their actual and ideal perceptions of the librarian's performance.

ANOVA--Superintendents, Librarians, Principals

The null hypotheses for the three major groups were rejected in 54 instances. One-way analysis of variance yielded significant differences between superintendents and principals on 7 of 46 responsibility items, between superintendents and librarians on 15 of 46 responsibility items, and between principals and librarians on 20 of 46 responsibility items. Librarians and principals differed significantly on 12 of 68 performance items. The ANOVA statistic from 31 of the 206 comparisons made to test the three basic hypotheses was not used because the assumption of equal variances was not met (see note, page 12). Thus, of the 175 usable comparisons, 54 (31%) showed significant differences between groups and 121 (69%)

did not.

Differences between librarians and administrators.--Librarians perceived their current (acuual) level of performance to be significantly higher than the administrators did in areas of service such as providing teachers with lists of materials useful for instruction; providing multi-cultural, multi-ethnic materials; and storing and scheduling audiovisual equipment. Statements ranked significantly higher by librarians than administrators on the ideal scale were also generally in service areas such as selecting, previewing, acquiring, circulating, and evaluating materials. Two notable exceptions, related to the instructional role of librarians, were developing listening, viewing, and responding skills and participating on curriculum committees.

Administrators gave significantly higher actual rankings (and thus attributed more responsibility or higher performance) than librarians themselves did for management functions such as planning facilities, preparing proposals for outside funding, and managing campus level production of materials. Administrators also gave significantly higher actual rankings to two instructional functions--applying instructional design principles to locally produced materials and participating on curriculum planning committees. In only two cases did administrators project an ideal condition which was significantly higher than that envisioned by librarians for themselves: responsibility for planning remodeled quarters and managing campus level production of materials.

Differences between superintendents and principals.--Rankings given by superintendents were significantly higher than those given by principals on the statements concerned with preparing the educational specifications for new facilities; planning for the floor design, furnishings, etc., for new facilities; planning facilities for local design and production; and formulating policies

for selecting print materials. Rankings given to librarians' roles and functions by principals were significantly higher than those given to them by superintendents only on statements related to developing listening, viewing, and responding skills and to storing and scheduling of audio-visual equipment.

Differences between major groups not significant.--The eighteen statements for which no significant difference was found between major groups on either the actual or the ideal condition presumably represent areas of agreement on the roles and functions of librarians. Functions uniformly perceived at high levels of performance or responsibility by the three major groups included organizing materials, providing access to materials through a card catalog, maintaining financial records, and supervising library staff. Functions uniformly perceived at low levels of performance or responsibility included conducting in-service training for teachers, developing reading and responding skills, and providing information to teachers on new teaching developments.

Don't Know responses, actual condition.--The frequency with which principals and librarians indicated lack of knowledge of the actual condition was examined. The rate of Don't Know responses for elementary and/or secondary principals exceeded 10% on 13 of the 57 statements. For librarians the Don't Know rate exceeded 10% on 7 of the 57 statements.

Both principals and librarians exceeded the 10% level of Don't Know responses on statements 3, planning for the floor design, furnishings, etc., for new facilities; 5, preparing proposals for obtaining outside funds; 36, using the systems approach to planning; and 56, applying instructional design concepts to locally produced materials.

ANOVA--Subgroups of Librarians

Differences between elementary and secondary librarians.--The rankings of elementary librarians were significantly higher than those of secondary librarians on the actual and/or the ideal condition for eight statements. These were mostly service oriented functions such as developing listening, viewing, and responding skills; teaching students to use available materials; and promoting the library's collections and services.

The rankings of secondary librarians were significantly higher than those of elementary librarians on six statements. These were, for the most part, management oriented functions such as gathering statistical data, applying basic research data to management, and preparing an annual report.

The differences between urban elementary librarians and urban secondary librarians were nearly the same as those found between all elementary and secondary librarians.

In general, librarians gave higher rankings to such traditional roles and functions as teaching students how to use library materials than they did to management functions, such as planning, or to functions related to the production of materials.

Differences between librarians from large and small districts.--Rankings of librarians from large districts were significantly higher than rankings of librarians from small districts on twelve statements. Most of these were service oriented functions such as disseminating information on the availability of resources, providing information on new teaching developments, and helping students choose appropriate materials.

Librarians from small districts gave significantly higher rankings to only four statements, all management related: providing in-service education for staff,

formulating policies for selecting materials, developing acquisition procedures for print materials, and evaluating policies and procedures.

Differences between librarians from urban and rural districts.--The sub-hypothesis regarding responses of urban versus rural librarians could not be tested because there were not enough responses from rural librarians.

ANOVA-- Subgroups of Principals

Differences between elementary and secondary principals.--The rankings given by secondary principals were higher than those given by elementary principals in every case where significant differences between the two groups occurred. A little over half of the statements (29 of 57) yielded statistically significant differences on the actual and/or ideal scale. Significant differences were found in such areas as planning facilities, preparing proposals for funding, obtaining resources from beyond the local campus, selecting and acquiring materials, disseminating information on resources and services, gathering and using statistical and research data, providing resources for curricular and recreational needs, and applying instructional design principles to locally produced materials. ANOVA for urban elementary principals vs. urban secondary principals revealed significant differences similar to those found for all secondary vs. all elementary principals.

Differences between principals from large and small districts.--Principals in small districts gave librarians significantly higher rankings than did principals from large districts on management related areas such as planning facilities and preparing proposals for obtaining outside funds.

Conversely, principals from large districts gave higher rankings to service or instruction related functions such as developing listening, viewing, and responding skills, conducting in-service programs for teachers, helping students

choose appropriate materials, and participating on curriculum committees.

Differences between principals from urban and rural districts.--Significant differences were found on the rankings for 19 of the 57 statements in the comparison of principals from urban and rural districts. Urban principals gave the higher rankings for performance area statements such as disseminating information on resources and services, gathering and using statistical and research data, and providing resources and materials. Rural principals, on the other hand, gave higher rankings to responsibility area statements such as planning for the floor design, furnishings, etc., for new facilities; preparing proposals for obtaining outside funds; formulating policies for selecting print materials; and developing acquisition procedures for print materials.

Superintendent Interviews

Interviews were conducted with superintendents to obtain reaction to major findings and seek advisement on possible actions which might be desirable. Interview areas included planning; applying for funds; participating on curriculum planning committees; selecting materials and equipment; developing listening, viewing, and responding skills of students.

Superintendent interviews indicated that the findings have face validity, that administrators would generally welcome librarians who seek more responsibility, and that administrators are often ill-informed about the value of librarian participation in curriculum planning and management.

Conclusions

The following major conclusions have been drawn from this study:

(1) Superintendents, principals, and librarians agreed that the actual conditions in school libraries are a long way from the desired level. The groups most con-

sistently dissatisfied with librarian performance were rural principals (as opposed to urban principals) and elementary principals (as opposed to secondary principals). Each of these sub-groups in the study typically shares the services of one librarian with other schools in the district, and we believe that this part-time service accounts for the wider gaps between their perceived actual conditions and their perceived ideal conditions.

(2) The three major respondent groups assigned higher actual and ideal rankings to the librarian's responsibility for selection and acquisition of print materials than to his/her responsibility for selection and acquisition of audiovisual materials and equipment. We conclude, therefore, that responsibility for audiovisual materials and equipment is less recognized as properly belonging to the librarian than is the responsibility for print materials. Information obtained from interviews with superintendents indicates that library tradition, media history, and, possibly, sex role stereotyping have combined to deprive AV equipment and materials of a place in the libraries of many of the schools surveyed.

In a related area, we conclude that the low rankings assigned by librarians to local production of materials and to instructional design functions reflect their lack of training and, perhaps, a hesitancy to become involved in activities when their role has not been clearly established.

(3) Librarians are not participating as fully in management decisions as they could be if they were more assertive. Superintendents and principals see opportunities for librarians to assume more responsibility for management activities, such as planning, than the librarians in this study have heretofore undertaken.

We assume that many librarians would, of necessity, have answered such management-related statements as "The librarian participates in planning new facilities..." from a hypothetical, rather than an experiental, perspective. These responses may

give us a picture, then, of how librarians think their administrators would involve them in management decisions if an opportunity should present itself. Since librarians believe they would be allowed to give only limited input, we conclude that librarians do not generally see themselves as having much actual influence with their administrators or much actual control over their working environment.

Rankings librarians gave themselves on traditional functions such as selecting, acquiring, and organizing materials tend to be higher than those given to them by principals and suggest that librarians feel secure and comfortable in these traditional areas. Conversely, the lower rankings which librarians gave themselves on management and production functions indicate that confidence is lacking there.

Superintendent interviews indicate that the low level of librarian involvement in planning is due, at least in part, to administrators' hesitance to ask busy people to attend additional after-school meetings; but if librarians will ask to be included, their participation in planning sessions will be welcomed.

(4) There is an apparent relationship between the size of the school district and the situation of the librarian in regard to service versus management functions. While campus level librarians in large districts may have input into policy formulation and procedure development, they apparently do not have primary responsibility in these areas and therefore devote more time to day-to-day service. On the other hand, one person may be the only librarian in a small district and may have responsibility for several campuses. This apparently causes librarians in small districts to emphasize management functions over service functions in order to provide training and guidance for the campus-level aides and volunteers who are so essential in these circumstances.

These observations do not, however, provide insight as to why librarians in small districts have lower ideal rankings on library service statements than do librarians in large districts. Perhaps it is a matter of lowered sights, given the realities (money, staffing, size of collection) of their situation.

(5) The librarian is not viewed as a true colleague of the classroom teacher. The uniformly high actual rankings given by both librarians and principals to librarian performance in statements 47, formulating specific objectives; 48, circulating materials; 49, organizing materials; 51, providing access through a card catalog or other records; 55, maintaining financial records; and 57, supervising library staff; indicate that the standard current expectation for librarians is that they provide and manage an organized collection. On the other hand, the low rankings given to 9, designing and conducting in-service training for teachers, 13, developing listening, viewing, and responding skills; 14, developing reading and responding skills; 27, providing information to teachers on new teaching developments; and 29, participating on curriculum planning committees support the conclusion that librarians are not generally accepted in--and don't, as a group, perceive themselves in--the teaching or instructional role.

(6) Librarian activitiy in providing access to resources from beyond the local campus is limited mainly to coordinating deliveries from, and returns to, school district centers.

(7) The number of Don't Know responses by both librarians and principals is cause for concern, since subordinate and superordinate relationships fare better in an atmosphere where the roles and functions of each are known--to themselves and to one another. An administrator's support for library activities is, at least in part, a function of his/her knowledge of those activities. We conclude that the lack of formal communication from the librarian by such means as annual reports and

budget requests is often a contributing factor to the administrator's lack of information.

Recommendations Drawn From the Study

The seven major recommendations which follow are drawn from and are parallel to the seven major conclusions presented above.

(1) Reduction of the gap between actual and ideal conditions generally, and alleviation of the critical needs in elementary and rural schools in particular, can only be accomplished by more adequate staffing and resources. School administrators need a better understanding of learning resources centers before they can argue convincingly for adequate financing. Two recommendations are offered in this regard. First, one-to-one communication with superintendents and their assistants is needed to explain the value of libraries generally and to promote appropriate participation by librarians in such activities as planning and in curriculum development. These and other nonclerical roles and functions of the librarian need to be outlined for school administrators by library supervisors, library educators, and Education Service Center personnel.

Second, we support the establishment and identification of demonstration libraries as suggested by one superintendent during the superintendent interviews. He felt that superintendents are, of necessity, fiscally oriented and probably not as aware as they should be of the place of learning resources centers in the schools. Visits to demonstration libraries representative of different sized districts could produce greater awareness in administrative and other school personnel. The demonstration library concept could be handled through the State Department of Education or through appropriate regional centers.

(2) Since selecting and maintaining audiovisual materials and equipment is central to the concept of a unified media center, pre-service and in-service education for

Learning Resources Specialists and for all other school personnel must recognize and support the learning resources specialists' responsibility in this area. In-service education on new production methods and instructional design principles should be offered to help librarians achieve the competencies specified in the certification requirements. We recommend that all education efforts in this regard emphasize the development of appropriate role perceptions on the part of the learning resources specialists themselves.

(3) Since administrators indicated a willingness for librarians to assume more responsibility for planning, librarians should reassess their current activities and prepare to provide more input to administrative planning for school libraries. Toward this end, pre-service and in-service education should include instruction in, for example, data gathering, so that librarians will know what data are to be gathered, how to gather data, and how the data can be used to provide information for management decisions and/or to provide justification for requests to school administrators.

(4) Curriculum planners for pre-service library education should provide programs which recognize and address such differences as those found between large school districts and small school districts.

(5) It has long been an assumption of leaders in the school media field that librarians are faculty rather than support staff. One important way that in-service librarians can demonstrate their commitment to a faculty role is by actively seeking greater involvement in curriculum planning and development, and we strongly recommend thatythey do so. This will mean that some librarians will have to quit getting satisfaction from having people say, "Look at our poor, overworked librarian; she is doing so much we couldn't ask her to do any more." Some will have to be more assertive and say "I would like to attend the curriculum planning sessions because I need to be there to do my job right, and you need me

there to do the curriculum planning right." And many librarians will need to take the time and the effort to learn about approaches to instructional design so they can be contributing participants in the process.

(6) Librarians should increase their efforts to provide access to additional sources of learning materials by establishing formal links with public libraries and other community resources. The responsibility for providing interlibrary loan service should be assumed by the librarian. Furthermore, the librarian is the logical person to provide centralized coordination of access to community resources, even though counselors and teachers may also maintain files pertinent to their activities.

(7) An annual report either to an administrator or to a library supervisor can be a valuable tool; and the merits of preparing such a report, along with preparation guidelines, should be presented in pre-service and in-service education.

Recommendations for Further Research

(1) We have suggested that staffing is the key factor in perceptions of roles and functions. A study using data obtained from the current study is planned to compare responses from districts which have full-time elementary librarians in every school with those where one librarian servces two or more schools to see what effect full versus part-time staffing has on the way elementary principals view the roles and functions of librarians. The proposed study will also compare responses from districts which have school library supervisors with those which have none.

(2) Those who go into school administration need to know more about what they should be able to expect from librarians, and a curriculum study to investigate means for providing this information in the pre-service education programs for school administrators should be undertaken.

(3) This study was a cooperative effort of a university and its library school, state education agencies, and school districts ranging in size from Dallas and Fort Worth down to single campus rural schools. It included a geographic area of 14,166 square miles--a little larger than Maryland and Deleware combined--with a population of 2,659,300. We believe, therefore, that the information presented here can be generalized to a wider population. It seems logical that planned, co-ordinated replication of this study would be useful, however, since there is a need for some means to cumulate information to serve as a base line for planning at the local, area, or state-wide levels. Needs assessments have been done in various ways in variuos places, but there is no way to cumulate and synthesize compatible data from a large number of locations to provide valid generalizations at state, regional and national levels. These wider generalizations would be of particular interest to officers of national associations such as AECT, AASL, and NASSP and to educational programs preparing media specialists capable of working effectively in any section of the country.

APPENDIX I

SURVEY INSTRUMENT AND COVER LETTERS

NORTH TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LIBRARY AND INFORMATION SCIENCES
AND
EDUCATION SERVICE CENTERS TEN AND ELEVEN

STUDY OF ACTUAL AND IDEAL ROLES OF SCHOOL LIBRARIANS

DIRECTIONS:

The following statements represent areas of responsibility and performance identified for the campus level librarian (learning resources specialist) in the recently developed "Guidelines for the Preparation of the Campus Learning Resources Specialist" prepared for submission to the State Board of Examiners for Teacher Education.

Please complete the survey instrument by indicating for each statement:

1. Your perception of the actual condition in your school or district in the left hand scale,
2. Your judgment as to the ideal condition for that role or function in the right hand scale.

Responses will be tabulated by computer. Disregard computer instructions represented by bracketed numbers such as [14] appearing throughout.

[1 — — — — — — — — — — — 12]
Computer Use

AREAS OF RESPONSIBILITY

Actual Level of Responsibility								Ideal Level of Responsibility						
	DON'T KNOW	HAS LITTLE OR NO RESPONSIBILITY	HAS SOME RESPONSIBILITY	HAS CONSIDERABLE RESPONSIBILITY	HAS MUCH RESPONSIBILITY	HAS COMPLETE RESPONSIBILITY			DON'T KNOW	HAS LITTLE OR NO RESPONSIBILITY	HAS SOME RESPONSIBILITY	HAS CONSIDERABLE RESPONSIBILITY	HAS MUCH RESPONSIBILITY	HAS COMPLETE RESPONSIBILITY
[13]	0	1	2	3	4	5	1. The librarian has responsibility for formulating long range plans for the library.	[15]	0	1	2	3	4	5
[14]	0	1	2	3	4	5	2. When new or remodeled library facilities are needed, the librarian has responsibility for preparing the educational specifications for them.	[16]	0	1	2	3	4	5

BE SURE TO COMPLETE BOTH SCALES

AREAS OF RESPONSIBILITY

	Actual Level of Responsibility								Ideal Level of Responsibility						
	DON'T KNOW	HAS LITTLE OR NO RESPONSIBILITY	HAS SOME RESPONSIBILITY	HAS CONSIDERABLE RESPONSIBILITY	HAS MUCH RESPONSIBILITY	HAS COMPLETE RESPONSIBILITY			DON'T KNOW	HAS LITTLE OR NO RESPONSIBILITY	HAS SOME RESPONSIBILITY	HAS CONSIDERABLE RESPONSIBILITY	HAS MUCH RESPONSIBILITY	HAS COMPLETE RESPONSIBILITY
[17]	0	1	2	3	4	5	3. When new or remodeled library facilities are planned, the librarian has responsibility for planning for the floor design, furnishings, etc.	[23]	0	1	2	3	4	5
[18]	0	1	2	3	4	5	4. The librarian has responsibility for planning facilities for local design and production of learning resources.	[24]	0	1	2	3	4	5
[19]	0	1	2	3	4	5	5. When funds are available from sources outside the local district, the librarian has responsibility for preparing proposals for obtaining them.	[25]	0	1	2	3	4	5
[20]	0	1	2	3	4	5	6. The librarian has responsibility for coordinating deliveries and returns of materials from the school district's center. (Answer only if your district maintains a district learning resources center)	[26]	0	1	2	3	4	5
[21]	0	1	2	3	4	5	7. The librarian has responsibility for coordinating deliveries and returns of materials from the regional service center.	[27]	0	1	2	3	4	5
[22]	0	1	2	3	4	5	8. The librarian has responsibility for providing for use of materials from outside the school by activities such as Interlibrary Loan and maintaining a community resources file.	[28]	0	1	2	3	4	5

AREAS OF RESPONSIBILITY

Actual Level of Responsibility								Ideal Level of Responsibility							
	DON'T KNOW	HAS LITTLE OR NO RESPONSIBILITY	HAS SOME RESPONSIBILITY	HAS CONSIDERABLE RESPONSIBILITY	HAS MUCH RESPONSIBILITY	HAS COMPLETE RESPONSIBILITY			DON'T KNOW	HAS LITTLE OR NO RESPONSIBILITY	HAS SOME RESPONSIBILITY	HAS CONSIDERABLE RESPONSIBILITY	HAS MUCH RESPONSIBILITY	HAS COMPLETE RESPONSIBILITY
[29]	0	1	2	3	4	5	9. The librarian has responsibility for designing and conducting in-service training programs for teachers.	[37]	0	1	2	3	4	5
[30]	0	1	2	3	4	5	10. The librarian has responsibility for providing in-service education for the library staff (including volunteers).	[38]	0	1	2	3	4	5
[31]	0	1	2	3	4	5	11. The librarian has responsibility for campus level production of materials that aid teachers in the classroom.	[39]	0	1	2	3	4	5
[32]	0	1	2	3	4	5	12. The librarian has responsibility for teaching students how to produce audio-visual materials.	[40]	0	1	2	3	4	5
[33]	0	1	2	3	4	5	13. The librarian has responsibility for developing the listening, viewing, and responding skills of students.	[41]	0	1	2	3	4	5
[34]	0	1	2	3	4	5	14. The librarian has responsibility for developing the reading and responding skills of students.	[42]	0	1	2	3	4	5
[35]	0	1	2	3	4	5	15. The librarian has responsibility for formulating and recommending for adoption policies for the evaluation and selection of audio-visual materials for the collection.	[43]	0	1	2	3	4	5
[36]	0	1	2	3	4	5	16. The librarian has responsibility for formulating and recommending for adoption policies for the evaluation and selection of library books, periodicals, and other print materials for the collection.	[44]	0	1	2	3	4	5

AREAS OF RESPONSIBILITY

Actual Level of Responsibility								Ideal Level of Responsibility						
	DON'T KNOW	HAS LITTLE OR NO RESPONSIBILITY	HAS SOME RESPONSIBILITY	HAS CONSIDERABLE RESPONSIBILITY	HAS MUCH RESPONSIBILITY	HAS COMPLETE RESPONSIBILITY			DON'T KNOW	HAS LITTLE OR NO RESPONSIBILITY	HAS SOME RESPONSIBILITY	HAS CONSIDERABLE RESPONSIBILITY	HAS MUCH RESPONSIBILITY	HAS COMPLETE RESPONSIBILITY
[45]	0	1	2	3	4	5	17. The librarian has responsibility for evaluating and selecting audio-visual equipment.	[52]	0	1	2	3	4	5
[46]	0	1	2	3	4	5	18. The librarian has responsibility for making adequate provision for previewing materials being considered for the collection.	[53]	0	1	2	3	4	5
[47]	0	1	2	3	4	5	19. The librarian has responsibility for developing and implementing procedures for acquisition (by purchase, exchange, or gift) of print materials.	[54]	0	1	2	3	4	5
[48]	0	1	2	3	4	5	20. The librarian has responsibility for developing and implementing procedures for acquisition of audio-visual materials.	[55]	0	1	2	3	4	5
[49]	0	1	2	3	4	5	21. The librarian has responsibility for acquiring audio-visual equipment.	[56]	0	1	2	3	4	5
[50]	0	1	2	3	4	5	22. The librarian has responsibility for the storage and scheduling of audio-visual equipment.	[57]	0	1	2	3	4	5
[51]	0	1	2	3	4	5	23. The librarian has responsibility for developing policies and procedures for maintenance of audio-visual equipment.	[58]	0	1	2	3	4	5

END OF RESPONSIBILITY AREAS

Note that Performance Area I follows with <u>different response categories</u>.

PERFORMANCE AREA I

Actual Performance								Ideal Performance							
	DON'T KNOW	NEVER; NOT AT ALL	INFREQUENTLY	SOMETIMES	FREQUENTLY	ALWAYS; SYSTEMATICALLY			DON'T KNOW	NEVER; NOT AT ALL	INFREQUENTLY	SOMETIMES	FREQUENTLY	ALWAYS; SYSTEMATICALLY
[59]	0	1	2	3	4	5	24. The librarian disseminates information to students and teachers on the availability of materials, equipment, and resources in the library.	[67]	0	1	2	3	4	5
[60]	0	1	2	3	4	5	25. The librarian promotes the library's collections and services by such means as displays, book talks, and classroom presentations.	[68]	0	1	2	3	4	5
[61]	0	1	2	3	4	5	26. The librarian disseminates information to students and teachers on effective use of materials and equipment.	[69]	0	1	2	3	4	5
[62]	0	1	2	3	4	5	27. The librarian provides information to teachers on new teaching developments and practices.	[70]	0	1	2	3	4	5
[63]	0	1	2	3	4	5	28. The librarian provides teachers with lists of materials useful in instruction.	[71]	0	1	2	3	4	5
[64]	0	1	2	3	4	5	29. The librarian participates on curriculum planning committees.	[72]	0	1	2	3	4	5
[65]	0	1	2	3	4	5	30. The librarian designs information systems to meet the needs of students and teachers.	[73]	0	1	2	3	4	5
[66]	0	1	2	3	4	5	31. The librarian helps students choose appropriate materials to meet learning needs.	[74]	0	1	2	3	4	5

PERFORMANCE AREA I

CC 1 2
DUP 2-12
[Computer Use]

	Actual Performance								Ideal Performance							
	DON'T KNOW	NEVER; NOT AT ALL	INFREQUENTLY	SOMETIMES	FREQUENTLY	ALWAYS; SYSTEMATICALLY			DON'T KNOW	NEVER; NOT AT ALL	INFREQUENTLY	SOMETIMES	FREQUENTLY	ALWAYS; SYSTEMATICALLY
[13]	0	1	2	3	4	5	32. The librarian teaches students how to use materials available in the library.	[22]	0	1	2	3	4	5
[14]	0	1	2	3	4	5	33. The librarian applies learning theories to the evaluation of materials for inclusion in the collection.	[23]	0	1	2	3	4	5
[15]	0	1	2	3	4	5	34. The librarian evaluates materials for inclusion in the collection by utilizing suggestions from administrators and teachers.	[24]	0	1	2	3	4	5
[16]	0	1	2	3	4	5	35. The librarian incorporates new production methods into the production of media.	[25]	0	1	2	3	4	5
[17]	0	1	2	3	4	5	36. The librarian uses the systems approach to the study and design of library services.	[26]	0	1	2	3	4	5
[18]	0	1	2	3	4	5	37. The librarian gathers statistical data for use in managing the library.	[27]	0	1	2	3	4	5
[19]	0	1	2	3	4	5	38. The librarian applies basic research data reported in the literature to the management of the library.	[28]	0	1	2	3	4	5
[20]	0	1	2	3	4	5	39. The librarian plans and conducts research projects to provide information for decision making.	[29]	0	1	2	3	4	5
[21]	0	1	2	3	4	5	40. The librarian reads professional publications to keep abreast of developments in the field.	[30]	0	1	2	3	4	5

END OF PERFORMANCE AREA I
Performance Area II follows with different response categories.

PERFORMANCE AREA II

Actual Performance								Ideal Performance							
	DON'T KNOW	MAKES NO PROVISION	MAKES MINIMAL PROVISION	MAKES PARTIAL PROVISION	MAKES SUBSTANTIAL PROVISION	MAKES COMPLETE PROVISION			DON'T KNOW	MAKES NO PROVISION	MAKES MINIMAL PROVISION	MAKES PARTIAL PROVISION	MAKES SUBSTANTIAL PROVISION	MAKES COMPLETE PROVISION
[31]	0	1	2	3	4	5	41. The librarian makes provision for evaluation of the library's policies and procedures.	[37]	0	1	2	3	4	5
[32]	0	1	2	3	4	5	42. The librarian makes provision for reference services for the students and teachers in the school	[38]	0	1	2	3	4	5
[33]	0	1	2	3	4	5	43. The librarian makes provision for resources which will support the school's curricular program.	[39]	0	1	2	3	4	5
[34]	0	1	2	3	4	5	44. The librarian makes provision for materials to meet the recreational needs of the students.	[40]	0	1	2	3	4	5
[35]	0	1	2	3	4	5	45. The librarian makes provision for professional materials to meet the needs of teachers and administrators.	[41]	0	1	2	3	4	5
[36]	0	1	2	3	4	5	46. The librarian makes provision for multi-cultural and multi-ethnic materials.	[42]	0	1	2	3	4	5

END OF PERFORMANCE AREA II

Performance Area III follows with <u>different response categories</u>.

PERFORMANCE AREA III

Actual Performance					Ideal Performance				
	DON'T KNOW	YES	NO			DON'T KNOW	YES	NO
[43]	0	1	5	47. The librarian formulates and is guided by specific objectives for the library.	[54]	0	1	5
[44]	0	1	5	48. The librarian provides adequate procedures for circulating print and audio-visual materials.	[55]	0	1	5
[45]	0	1	5	49. Print materials are organized according to the Dewey Decimal or other accepted classification system.	[56]	0	1	5
[46]	0	1	5	50. Audio-visual materials are organized according to the Dewey decimal or other accepted classification system.	[57]	0	1	5
[47]	0	1	5	51. Access to print materials is provided through a card catalog and/or other records.	[58]	0	1	5
[48]	0	1	5	52. Access to audio-visual materials is provided through a card catalog and/or other records.	[59]	0	1	5
[49]	0	1	5	53. The librarian prepares an annual report on the progress and activities of the library.	[60]	0	1	5
[50]	0	1	5	54. The librarian prepares an annual budget request.	[61]	0	1	5
[51]	0	1	5	55. The librarian maintains financial records to show campus level allocations and expenditures.	[62]	0	1	5
[52]	0	1	5	56. The librarian applies instructional design principles to the design of locally produced materials.	[63]	0	1	5
[53]	0	1	5	57. The librarian provides adequate supervision of the library staff (including volunteers).	[64]	0	1	5

Thank you for participating. Please return the completed survey to Dr. Fred C. Pfister, School of Library and Information Sciences, North Texas State University, Denton, Texas 76203.

North Texas State University
Denton, Texas 76203
School of Library and Information Sciences

Dear Librarian,

Education Service Centers Ten and Eleven are cooperating with North Texas State University in a faculty research study, "Actual and Ideal Roles and Functions of Texas School Librarians as Perceived by School Superintendents, Principals, and Librarians". The study is an attempt to provide a realistic base of information for planning pre-service and in-service education of school librarians by asking, (1) what are school librarians doing now, and (2) what should they be doing?

Your superintendent of schools has given permission to conduct the study in your district. I am enclosing a questionnaire survey for your response and return to me in the self-addressed, postage paid envelope on or before February 20, 1976. The anonymity of survey participants will be protected by removing all identification when the surveys are processed, and no individual or school will be identifiable in the data summary.

Your thoughtful response to the survey form will be a significant contribution to the information base we are seeking to establish. Allow me to thank you in advance for your consideration and cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Fred C. Pfister

Fred C. Pfister, Ph.D
Associate Professor

FCP:lb

N.T. Box 13796 • AC 817-788-2445

North Texas State University
Denton, Texas 76203
School of Library and Information Sciences

Dear Principal,

Education Service Centers Ten and Eleven are cooperating with North Texas State University in a faculty research study, "Actual and Ideal Roles and Functions of Texas School Librarians as Perceived by School Superintendents, Principals, and Librarians". The study is an attempt to provide a realistic base of information for planning pre-service and in-service education of school librarians by asking, (1) what are school librarians doing now, and (2) what should they be doing?

Your superintendent of schools has given permission to conduct the study in your district. I am enclosing a questionnaire survey for your response and return to me in the self-addressed, postage paid envelope on or before February 20, 1976. The anonymity of survey participants will be protected by removing all identification when the surveys are processed, and no individual or school will be identifiable in the data summary.

Your thoughtful response to the survey form will be a significant contribution to the information base we are seeking to establish. Allow me to thank you in advance for your consideration and cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Fred C. Pfister

Fred C. Pfister, Ph.D
Associate Professor

FCP:lb

N.T. Box 13796 • AC 817-788-2445

School of Library and
Information Sciences
North Texas State University
N. T. Box 13796
Denton, Texas 76230
September 16, 1975

Dear

Education Service Centers X and XI are cooperating with North Texas State University in a faculty research study, "Actual and Ideal Roles and Functions of Texas School Librarians". I have enclosed a summary of the study and will provide further information should you request it. The study will seek information from school superintendents, principals, and school librarians in Education Service Regions X and XI. When completed, it will provide data useful for evaluating the practical value of school library certification programs and for Education Service Center planning of in-service education programs. As is customary, the anonymity of respondents will be protected when the findings are reported.

May I have your permission to mail a questionnaire survey to you and to the principals and librarians in your district in January 1976? Your support in this regard would certainly be appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

Dear Superintendent:

Please fill out the first 23 items on the survey and return the questionnaire at your earliest convenience, and not later than February 20, 1976. If you are willing to have the principals and librarians in your district participate, but will be delayed in returning your own survey form, we would appreciate an early return of the authorization printed below.

- -

The survey on "Actual and Ideal Roles of School Librarians" as Perceived by Superintendents, Principals, and Librarians may be mailed to the principals and librarians in this district.

_____

(Signature)

APPENDIX II

A COMPARISON OF ACTUAL RANKINGS WITH IDEAL RANKINGS:

DATA FROM THE T-TEST FOR CORRELATED SAMPLES

T-TEST FOR CORRELATED SAMPLES FOR 324 LIBRARIANS

STATEMENT	ACTUAL CONDITION		IDEAL CONDITION		DIFFERENCE		TEST	
	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	T	P
1	3.00617	1.24417	3.89815	0.70741	-0.89198	1.11452	-14.40575	0.0000
2	1.90432	1.32613	3.71914	0.83544	-1.81481	1.36847	-23.87087	0.0000
3	1.79938	1.30011	3.72222	0.83462	-1.92284	1.38889	-24.92000	0.0000
4	1.73148	1.26349	3.20062	1.18290	-1.46914	1.34313	-19.68867	0.0000
5	1.37037	1.29724	2.70679	1.36876	-1.33642	1.38583	-17.35822	0.0000
6	2.05864	2.06241	2.30556	2.06605	-0.24691	1.06775	-4.16245	0.0000
7	2.34877	1.77843	2.84877	1.70738	-0.50000	1.42403	-6.32009	0.0000
8	2.25309	1.62340	3.17901	1.51527	-0.92593	1.37674	-12.10585	0.0000
9	1.59568	1.02603	2.49383	1.18163	-0.89815	1.07554	-15.03127	0.0000
10	3.66358	1.71348	4.17284	1.32179	-0.50926	1.34345	-6.82321	0.0000
11	1.88889	1.21650	2.69136	1.27021	-0.80247	1.11749	-12.92578	0.0000
12	1.69753	1.26192	2.62346	1.36527	-0.92593	1.27396	-13.08255	0.0000
13	1.89198	1.08639	2.50617	1.15513	-0.61420	0.97773	-11.30735	0.0000
14	1.86111	1.00886	2.34259	1.12249	-0.48148	0.87428	-9.91294	0.0000
15	2.83642	1.50575	3.69444	1.03611	-0.85802	1.28996	-11.97283	0.0000
16	3.91975	1.23408	4.20679	0.84959	-0.28704	0.97699	-5.28836	0.0000
17	2.41049	1.42338	3.41975	1.12241	-1.00926	1.25283	-14.50055	0.0000
18	2.79012	1.50924	3.66049	1.15468	-0.87037	1.23237	-12.71258	0.0000
19	3.50926	1.51051	3.98148	1.06141	-0.47222	1.09424	-7.76793	0.0000
20	2.87037	1.59775	3.71605	1.18802	-0.84568	1.34956	-11.27940	0.0000
21	2.17901	1.35338	3.21296	1.25940	-1.03395	1.31745	-14.12657	0.0000
22	3.76235	1.58231	4.00617	1.30963	-0.24383	1.30460	-3.36417	0.0009
23	2.72840	1.65256	3.42593	1.39573	-0.69753	1.36787	-9.17889	0.0000
24	4.17284	0.85536	4.66667	0.79472	-0.49383	0.78094	-11.38228	0.0000
25	3.66975	1.06690	4.37346	0.93738	-0.70370	1.08971	-11.62384	0.0000
26	3.55864	1.07589	4.29012	0.92225	-0.73148	0.97910	-13.44774	0.0000
27	2.48148	1.22776	3.16975	1.41165	-0.68827	1.06958	-11.58290	0.0000
28	3.42901	1.11195	4.10802	1.02782	-0.67901	1.06247	-11.50357	0.0000
29	1.97840	1.27957	3.85494	1.28118	-1.87654	1.50650	-22.42137	0.0000
30	2.59568	1.60498	3.50309	1.65527	-0.90741	1.23321	-13.24455	0.0000

T-TEST FOR CORRELATED SAMPLES FOR 324 LIBRARIANS, continued

STATEMENT	ACTUAL CONDITION		IDEAL CONDITION		DIFFERENCE		TEST	
	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	T	P
31	4.29012	0.80388	4.54938	0.80288	-0.25926	0.69099	-6.75359	0.0000
32	4.32716	0.91652	4.64815	0.91070	-0.32099	0.83762	-6.89788	0.0000
33	3.98457	1.26506	4.36420	1.13080	-0.37963	0.89079	-7.67105	0.0000
34	4.40432	0.87630	4.50926	0.97804	-0.10494	0.70914	-2.66362	0.0081
35	2.52160	1.44972	3.57407	1.47971	-1.05247	1.32622	-14.28459	0.0000
36	2.25000	1.73718	2.79630	1.99578	-0.54630	1.11325	-8.83296	0.0000
37	2.94136	1.52572	3.65432	1.42868	-0.71296	1.20410	-10.65801	0.0000
38	2.86111	1.37283	3.62346	1.36754	-0.76235	1.07130	-12.80897	0.0000
39	2.04938	1.24569	3.00926	1.46261	-0.95988	1.27184	-13.58485	0.0000
40	4.19444	0.93892	4.68210	0.77949	-0.48765	0.84559	-10.38069	0.0000
41	3.14815	1.30359	4.04012	1.16513	-0.89198	1.07493	-14.93636	0.0000
42	4.23765	0.92556	4.49383	0.88501	-0.25617	0.75422	-6.11375	0.0000
43	4.06481	0.93709	4.41667	1.00271	-0.35185	0.84730	-7.47470	0.0000
44	3.85494	1.16473	4.21296	1.07649	-0.35802	0.74333	-8.66972	0.0000
45	3.25926	1.13790	4.06790	1.05059	-0.80864	1.05004	-13.86188	0.0000
46	3.73765	1.09417	4.17284	1.02344	-0.43519	0.90687	-8.63778	0.0000

T-TEST FOR CORRELATED SAMPLES FOR 418 PRINCIPALS

STATEMENT	ACTUAL CONDITION		IDEAL CONDITION		DIFFERENCE		TEST	
	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	T	P
1	3.00000	1.14845	3.60526	0.92120	-0.60526	0.96940	-12.76528	0.0000
2	2.23684	1.31177	3.36603	0.98793	-1.12919	1.22624	-18.82694	0.0000
3	2.05502	1.34800	3.30383	1.00647	-1.24880	1.27710	-19.99200	0.0000
4	2.15311	1.28280	3.19378	1.11594	-1.04067	1.14250	-18.62287	0.0000
5	1.76555	1.41339	2.81818	1.36079	-1.05263	1.22214	-17.60936	0.0000
6	2.22967	2.02854	2.50478	2.06750	-0.27512	0.89142	-6.30996	0.0000
7	2.34928	1.74584	3.05024	1.66495	-0.70096	1.19513	-11.99121	0.0000
8	2.07656	1.54512	3.16986	1.46824	-1.09330	1.30426	-17.13809	0.0000
9	1.73206	1.05256	2.51914	1.14463	-0.78708	0.98921	-16.26743	0.0000
10	3.41388	1.58485	3.99043	1.23688	-0.57656	1.10161	-10.70040	0.0000
11	2.14833	1.25693	3.03110	1.25673	-0.88278	1.08096	-16.69659	0.0000
12	1.76316	1.22284	2.77033	1.31396	-1.00718	1.11774	-18.42265	0.0000
13	1.97847	1.07378	2.69378	1.15138	-0.71531	0.94846	-15.41931	0.0000
14	1.79187	0.95321	2.45215	1.09451	-0.66029	0.91584	-14.74020	0.0000
15	2.54785	1.30627	3.28469	1.05839	-0.73684	0.98069	-15.36137	0.0000
16	3.46172	1.22903	3.91148	0.93137	-0.44976	0.94887	-9.69091	0.0000
17	2.52632	1.27154	3.17703	1.08057	-0.65072	0.90695	-14.66894	0.0000
18	2.87321	1.31061	3.56459	1.02107	-0.69139	0.97841	-14.44736	0.0000
19	2.75598	1.46019	3.32775	1.25625	-0.57177	0.90077	-12.97767	0.0000
20	2.55024	1.36718	3.19617	1.19342	-0.64593	0.94399	-13.98965	0.0000
21	2.27990	1.30508	2.89234	1.28275	-0.61244	0.94858	-13.20017	0.0000
22	3.32775	1.53465	3.80861	1.23759	-0.48086	0.99441	-9.88655	0.0000
23	2.51914	1.46776	3.13397	1.36985	-0.61483	1.03301	-12.16855	0.0000
24	3.82057	1.09451	4.51675	0.78716	-0.69617	0.90617	-15.70714	0.0000
25	3.69378	1.18018	4.41866	0.83928	-0.72488	0.96877	-15.29796	0.0000
26	3.39713	1.12746	4.19617	0.88677	-0.79904	0.95601	-17.08818	0.0000
27	2.29187	1.17569	3.21770	1.27246	-0.92584	1.06244	-17.81633	0.0000
28	3.18900	1.25240	4.06938	1.02836	-0.88038	1.05032	-17.13720	0.0000
29	2.47368	1.38700	3.60287	1.24665	-1.12919	1.25140	-18.44834	0.0000
30	2.68660	1.39882	3.66029	1.35866	-0.97368	1.10233	-18.05903	0.0000

T-TEST FOR CORRELATED SAMPLES FOR 418 PRINCIPALS, continued

STATEMENT	ACTUAL CONDITION		IDEAL CONDITION		DIFFERENCE		TEST	
	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	T	P
31	3.72727	1.13470	4.28469	0.87206	-0.55742	0.84411	-13.50108	0.0000
32	4.10048	1.02227	4.54545	0.79512	-0.44498	0.81831	-11.11753	0.0000
33	3.01914	1.57304	3.94258	1.27945	-0.92344	1.28592	-14.68197	0.0000
34	3.80861	1.24146	3.45646	0.92641	-0.54785	0.95654	-11.70964	0.0000
35	2.49522	1.53808	3.47847	1.54105	-0.98325	1.20240	-16.71881	0.0000
36	2.06938	1.83033	2.96651	1.99251	-0.89713	1.36290	-13.45795	0.0000
37	2.41627	1.70594	3.46890	1.57170	-1.05263	1.39788	-15.39557	0.0000
38	2.30144	1.70626	3.35167	1.68596	-1.05024	1.43938	-14.91768	0.0000
39	1.72967	1.37505	2.93062	1.57847	-1.20096	1.34211	-18.29486	0.0000
40	3.33493	1.68866	4.31579	1.05748	-0.98086	1.48360	-13.51695	0.0000
41	2.95215	1.49743	3.93780	1.19790	-0.98565	1.30477	-15.44451	0.0000
42	3.67703	1.29507	4.23684	1.05207	-0.55981	0.91222	-12.54666	0.0000
43	3.63876	1.17370	4.25120	0.92995	-0.61244	0.88853	-14.09223	0.0000
44	3.19139	1.38568	3.88278	1.18873	-0.69139	0.99301	-14.23498	0.0000
45	3.14593	1.22924	4.04785	0.94836	-0.90191	1.04913	-17.57620	0.0000
46	3.44737	1.28573	4.04067	1.04148	-0.59330	0.95819	-12.65933	0.0000

T-TEST FOR CORRELATED SAMPLES FOR 72 SUPERINTENDENTS

STATEMENT	ACTUAL CONDITION		IDEAL CONDITION		DIFFERENCE		TEST	
	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	T	P
1	3.23611	1.10687	3.69444	0.92901	-0.45833	1.13755	-3.41884	0.0010
2	2.83333	1.19859	3.54167	1.00614	-0.70833	1.10616	-5.43358	0.0000
3	2.66667	1.16280	3.45833	0.99205	-0.79167	1.22115	-5.50099	0.0000
4	2.70833	1.29395	3.30556	1.15842	-0.59722	1.12162	-4.51813	0.0000
5	2.08333	1.30815	2.86111	1.45646	-0.77778	1.25846	-5.24423	0.0000
6	0.79167	1.62669	0.87500	1.78363	-0.08333	0.76453	-0.92489	0.3582
7	2.02778	1.60081	2.80556	1.88873	-0.7778	1.36708	-4.79600	0.0000
8	2.12500	1.50059	3.19444	1.64992	-1.06944	1.39745	-6.49366	0.0000
9	1.56944	0.97614	2.25000	1.23048	-0.68056	0.99047	-5.83029	0.0000
10	3.11111	1.68302	3.87500	1.40359	-0.76389	1.38902	-4.66646	0.0000
11	2.00000	1.28917	2.83333	1.42414	-0.83333	1.16280	-6.08105	0.0000
12	1.41667	1.01745	2.56944	1.44209	-1.15278	1.19459	-8.18832	0.0000
13	1.66667	0.99293	2.40278	1.33912	-0.73611	1.06140	-5.88480	0.0000
14	1.65278	0.85847	2.27778	1.24722	-0.62500	0.99912	-5.30798	0.0000
15	2.50000	1.28917	3.20833	1.25527	-0.70833	1.09335	-5.49722	0.0000
16	3.61111	1.26219	3.94444	1.18546	-0.33333	1.17485	-2.40747	0.0187
17	2.30556	1.31769	2.81944	1.29274	-0.51389	0.90372	-4.82506	0.0000
18	3.12500	1.24400	3.58333	1.19565	-0.45833	1.06066	-3.66667	0.0005
19	3.00000	1.37380	3.33333	1.34269	-0.33333	1.07468	-2.63189	0.0104
20	2.50000	1.39415	3.09722	1.36516	-0.59722	1.02997	-4.92014	0.0000
21	1.97222	1.29975	2.63889	1.27053	-0.66667	1.13832	-4.96947	0.0000
22	2.75000	1.56322	3.44444	1.41311	-0.69444	1.12135	-5.25436	0.0000
23	2.23611	1.27260	2.95833	1.36802	-0.72222	1.14107	-5.37064	0.0000

Superintendents did not answer statements 24-57.

APPENDIX III

SUPERINTENDENTS INTERVIEWED

SUPERINTENDENTS INTERVIEWED

School District	Date of Interview	Person Interviewed
Sam Rayburn (Ivanhoe)	3/26/76	B.J. Mathews Superintendent
Whitewright	3/26/76	Richard L. Capps Superintendent
Denton	3/29/76	Robert McGee Superintendent
Muenster	3/30/76	L.B. Bruns Superintendent
Callisburg (Gainesville)	3/30/76	Rufus D. Moore Superintendent
Denison	4/2/76	Bill K. Ford Superintendent
Plano	4/6/76	Bill Holifield Curriculum Director
Allen	4/6/76	D.L. Rountree Superintendent
Mineral Wells	4/13/76	Bill Hall Superintendent
Northwest (Justin)	4/14/76	Truett Wilson Superintendent
Maypearl	4/16/76	Maury Winnie Superintendent
Mesquite	4/20/76	J.C. Cannaday Asst. Supt. Secondary Schools
Lewisville	4/20/76	Clayton Downing Asst. Supt. for Curriculum
Ponder	4/21/76	Archie M. Scott Superintendent
Boyd	4/23/76	Larry Enis Superintendent

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Association of School Librarians. Certification Model for Professional School Media Personnel. Chicago: American Library Association, 1976.

American Association of School Librarians and Association for Educational Communications and Technology. Media Programs: District and School. Chicago: American Library Association, 1975.

Anderson, Carolyn Joyce. "Role Expectations of the High School Librarians as Perceived by Librarians, Principals and Teachers." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Oregon, 1970.

Case, Robert N. Behavioral Requirements Analysis Checklist: A Compilation of Competency-Based Job Functions and Task Statements for School Library Media Personnel. Phase II School Library Manpower Project. Chicago: American Library Association, 1973.

Gaver, Mary V. Services of Secondary School Media Centers: Evaluation and Development. Chicago: American Library Association, 1971.

Gaver, Mary V. and Jones, Milbrey L. "Secondary Library Services: A Search For Essentials." Teachers College Record, Vol. 68, No. 3, Dec. 1966.

Jetter, Margaret Ann. "The Roles of the School Library Media Specialist in the Future: A Delphi Study." Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1972.

Liesener, James W. A Process for Planning School Media Programs: Defining Service Outputs, Determining Resource and Operational Requirements, and Estimating Program Costs. College Park, Md.: School of Library and Information Sciences, University of Maryland, 1972.

Lohrer, Alice. The Identification and Role of School Libraries That Function as Instructional Materials Centers and Implications For Library Education in the United States. 1970. ED038 150

Office of Education. The Education Professions 1971-1972. Part IV. "A Manpower Survey of the School Library Media Field." 1973. ED 082 801

Olson, Lowell Ellis. "Teachers', Principals', and Librarians' Perceptions of the School Librarian's Role." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1966.

"Preparation Program for the Education of the Campus-Level Learning Resources Specialist (Professional Certification)," Educational Resources and Techniques, Vol. 15, No. 1 (Spring, 1975): 7-12.

Ricking, Myrl and Booth, Robert E. Personnel Utilization in Libraries: A Systems Approach. Chicago: American Library Association, 1974.

School Library Manpower Project. Phase I Final Report to the Knapp Foundation. Chicago: American Library Association, 1970.

School Library Manpower Project. Curriculum Alternatives: Experiments in School Library Media Education. Chicago: American Library Association, 1974.

Smith, Susan Seabury. "The Role of the School Librarian in Curriculum Improvement." Ed.D. dissertation, Columbia University, Teachers College, 1956.

Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. Standards for Secondary Schools. Atlanta: Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, 1970.

Texas Education Agency. Guidelines for the Development of Campus Learning Resources Centers (Libraries). Austin, Texas: Texas Education Agency, 1974.